काव्यानुशासनम्

आचार्यश्रीहेमचन्द्रविरचितं

तच्च

द्वितीये पुस्तके

॥ प्रथमे विभागे ॥

गुजरातविद्यापीठे भूतपूर्वेण
संस्कृतसाहित्य-भारतीयप्राच्येतिहासाध्यापकेन
पुरातत्त्वमन्दिरभूतपूर्वमन्त्रिणा
परीक्षकोपाभिधेन छोटालालसूनुना रसिकलालेन
आङ्गलभाषायां निबद्धेन गूर्जरत्रेतिहासपूर्वकेण आचार्यश्रीहेमचन्द्रचरितेन
तद्विरचित-ग्रन्थसमालोचनसहितेन सनाथीकृतम्

॥ द्वितीये विभागे ॥

एम. ए.-इत्युपाधिधारिणा प्राप्तभाउदाजी-पारितोषिकेण वेदान्तविषये
प्राप्तभाण्डारकर-पारितोषिकेण गुजरातविद्यापीठे भूतपूर्व-संस्कृताध्यापकेन
एस्. एल. डी. आर्टस्कोलेजसंस्कृताध्यापकेन
आठवले इत्युपाभिधेन बलवन्तसूनुना रामचन्द्रेण
आङ्गलभाषायां रचितया काव्यानुशासनटिप्पण्या व्याकृतम्

श्रीकाशीविश्वविद्यालय उपकुलपतिपदारोपित-
आचार्यप्रवर-आनन्दशङ्करध्रुवमहोदयैः
पूर्ववचनिकया मण्डितम्

मुम्बईस्थ-श्री महावीरजैनविद्यालयेन
प्रकाशितम्

Published by
Messrs Motichand G. Kapadia & Chandulal S. Modi,
Hon. Secretaries, Shri Mahavir Jaina Vidyalaya,
Vidyalaya Buildings, Gowalia Tank Road,
Bombay 7.

First Edition] [1938

VOLUMES I-II—*PRICE RUPEES SIX*

Printed by
Manilal Purushottam Mistry, B. A.
Aditya Mudranalaya, Raikhad, Ahmedabad.

Publishers' Preface

We have great pleasure in placing before the public this complete edition of Kâvyânuṣâsana, as a masterly work of Ṣri Hemachandrâchârya the Great Jain Scholar with Alamkârachūḍāmaṇi and Viveka commentaries by the same author. This scholarly work of Sāhitya is almost the last word on the Science of Poetics dealing with all the branches of the interesting subject of Rasas, Alamkâras etc. The treatment of the subject is most scientific and elucidation of its various branches is clear and attractive and in fact leaves nothing to be desired.

With a view to prepare important Jain Works in the interests of the general public keeping in view its admission for the University curriculum, a resolutior was passed by the Managing Committee of Shri Mahavira Jaina Vidyalaya in the year 1928 to undertake publication of useful works for University purposes after getting prepared texts with notes thereon on modern lines; and in the first place they selected this great work of Hemachandrâchârya and entrusted the execution of the work to Mr. Rasiklal C. Parikh a scholar of great learning.

It is true that a considerable period has elapsed in carrying out the job, but the delay has been sufficiently compensated by the great care taken in preparing the correct copy of the text and supplementing the same by various important indexes which have literally enhanced the usefulness of the book. The same is calculated to facilitate Sahitya Students and research scholars in the matter of references.

But the more important part of the work is the history of Gujarat culminating with Hemchandracharya at the hands of Mr. Parikh. He has spared no pains to make the history very useful and informative. The value of the treatment is enhanced by the writer's supporting almost every statement thereof by quoting relevant authorities. In our view this part of the work will be a landmark in the history of Gujarati literature, and being useful both from historical as well as literary points of view, is sure to find its permanent place in the literary world.

Professor Athavale has prepared notes on the original text and commentary. He being a specialist on the science of Poetics has spared no pains to make the notes useful to the students of Sāhitya and has added to its usefulness by quoting and comparing the subjects under discussion with views of other scholars dealing with the subject of Sāhitya. The foreword at the hands of Acharya Dr. Anandshankar B. Dhruva has added to the intrinsic value of the publication.

If this publication meets with a proper response Shri Mahavira Jaina Vidyalaya is very likely to think of undertaking publication of Jain works of general utility with critical notes. For sometime past critical publication of Jain works has been considered a great necessity and we hope this publication will be considered a step towards removal of that long felt want. It is now for the public to judge about the utility of the book.

Vidyalaya Buildings
Gowalia Tank Road,
1st February 1938,
Bombay, 7.

Motichand G. Kapadia
Chandulal S. Modi
Hon. Secr.
Shri Mahavira Jaina Vidyalaya.

FOREWORD

It is with much pleasure that I contribute a brief 'Foreword' to this excellent edition of Hemachandra's "Kāvyānuśāsana" which has been prepared by two young scholars—Adhyāpaka Rasiklal C. Parikh of Gujarāt Vidyāpīṭha and Professor R. B. Athavale, formerly of the same Vidyāpīṭha and now Professor of Sanskrit at the Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Arts College, Ahmedabad.

My "Foreword" has necessarily to be brief in view of the elaborate Introduction, carefully edited Text of the Sūtrās and the two commentaries, the numerous Appendices and the explanatory Notes already make a volume of more than a thousand pages.

The Introduction is more than an ordinary preface giving the life of the author, enumerating his works and assesing their values. It sets forth the history of the Province to which the author belongs, from the earliest times recorded in the Purāṇas upto those of Siddharāja and Kumārapāla—the two celebrated kings of Gujarāt, who were great patrons of learning and were closely associated with Hemacandrācārya in his literary and religious activities. The purpose which the editors have in view relating this long story is to provide a background to the life and times of

Hemacandra', who is not only 'a conspicuous personality in the social and political history of Gujarat and one of the greatest apostles of the Jaina Church,' but is, at the same time, an important figure in the history of the Language and Literature of the whole of India. The chapter on Apabhraṃśa in his "*Śabdānuśāsana*" remains to this day the standard work on the language which is the immediate forerunner of more than one modern language of India. Similarly, his *Chandonuśāsana*" supplies information regarding the Prosody of Prākṛta and Apabhraṃśa which is found nowhere else. His "*Deśīnāmamālā*" is a unique work which contains a rich treasure of Deśya words which formed part of the vocabulary of ancient and medieval Indian Languages.

In writing "Śabdānuśāsana", "Chandonuśāsana" and "Kāvyānuśāsana", Hemacandra had for his object the preparation of works on three main branches of learning—Grammar, Prosody and Poetics—works which the Jainas could call their own. Although these works were also given other proper names*, namely, "Siddha-

* Here are two intriguing questions: What is the name of this book ? Does the name 'काव्यानुशासन' stand for the sūtras only or does it cover the commentary ('अलङ्कारचूडामणि') also ?

As regards the latter, the editors say: "The Sūtras and the Alaṃkāracūḍāmaṇi form one work and are to-gether referred to as "Kāvyānuśāsana," though, strictly speaking, according to the colophons at the end of the manuscripts of the work, the Alaṃkāracūḍāmaṇi is a commentary on the Kāvyānuśāsana and therefore the title Kāvyānuśāsana should be taken to denote the Sūtrās only." To the evidence of the colophons, I would add the more decisive evidence of the mangala verse of

Hemacandra","Chandoviciti" and "Alaṃkāracūḍāmaṇi", they were for the Jainas 'शब्द',–'छन्दस्'– and 'काव्य'–अनुशासन's or the Sciences of Grammar, Prosody and Poetics respectively.

---

the Alaṃkāracuḍāmaṇi (" प्रणम्य परमात्मानं निजं काव्यानुशासनम् etc " which I am inclined to regard as the mangalācaraṇa of अलङ्कारचूडामणि and not of काव्यानुशासन which has its own mangala– ' अकृत्रिम etc. ') which speaks of ' काव्यानुशासन ' as the name of the work of which अलङ्कारचूडामणि is the commentary. Against this, however, is to be set the statement at the commencement of विवेक "काव्यानुशासनस्यायं विवेकः प्रवितन्यते" that विवेक is a commentary on काव्यानुशासन where by ' काव्यानुशासन ' we have to understand the सूत्र or कारिका–cum–अलङ्कारचूडामणि since विवेक is actually a commentary not on one but on both. This apparent inconsistency is to be explained as arising from the fact that Hemacandra first composed the Sūtras and gave them the title ' काव्यानुशासन ' and to them he added an explanatory वृत्ति which he called अलङ्कारचूडामणि, and the two together were intended to be the Śāstra of काव्य (' काव्यानुशासन ').

A still more difficult question is —Is ' काव्यानुशासन' the name of the book or its description ? Possibly, it is the latter, meaning merely ' a work of Poetics ' like ' शब्दानुशासन' which means ' a work of Grammar ' the proper name of the work being सिद्धहेम or सिद्धहेमचन्द्र (Cf ' सिद्धहेमचन्द्राभिधानस्वोपज्ञशब्दानुशासनवृत्तौ ' in the colophon of Hemacandra's Grammar. Cf also what Hemacandra himself says under verse 2 of काव्यानुशासन viz. शब्दानुशासने सिद्धहेमचन्द्राभिधाने.) On the same lines, " छन्दोविचिति " and not ' छन्दोनुशासन ' would seem to be the name of the book, the latter being only a description meaning 'a work on prosody.' And yet these books are known more by their descriptive names namely, अनुशासनs of different subjects, rather than by the proper names such as ' सिद्धहेम ' etc.

In the preparation of these special works Hemachandra has been sometimes charged with 'plagiarism'. For example, in his work on Poetics with which we are here concerned, Hemacandra is accused of 'borrowing wholesale' from "Kāvyamīmāṃsā", "Kāvyaprakāśa", "Dhvanyāloka" and "Locana". But an impartial study of his work would show that Hemacandra wants the Jainas to know all that the Brāhmaṇas knew, and consequently he does not hesitate to reproduce the wisdom of his Brāhmaṇa predecessors, while making substantial addition to the stores he has inherited. Now, to compare the works from which he is said to have "borrowed wholesale" with his "Kāvyānuśāsana": "Kāvyamīmāṃsā is a brilliant miscellany on topics relating to Poetry, which, although it can claim originality in the matter of ideas and the mode of presenting them, does not pretend to be a systematic treatise like the "Kāvyaprakāśa" or the "Kāvyānuśāsana". The author of the "Kāvyaprakāśa" tries to work out a synthesis–it is at least a syncretism–of all the theories of Poetry from Bhāmaha downwards, and produces a comprehensive work on Poetics. Yet in so doing he leaves Dramaturgy out in the cold, except in so far as it is connected with *Rasa*. This omission Hemācandra duly supplies, and does what Viśvanātha does in the "Sāhityadarpaṇa" in a later age. The "Dhvanyāloka" and the "Locana" deal with only a certain aspect or type of Poetry and their scope is more limited than that of the Kāvyaprakāśa and à fortiori than that of the "Kāvyānuśāsana".

In justification of the wide range of their Introduction the editors remark that "the cultural life of

the city of Aṇahilavāḍa Pattaṇa"—with which Hema-candra was connected—was in the high tradition of Pāṭaliputra, Ujjayinī, Kānyakubja, Valabhi and Bhinnamāla", and thus the history of the kingdoms and empires of which these cities were capitals becomes distinctly relevant. The editors have accordingly collected information from all possible sources–such as, accounts of travellers, descriptions in literary works, architectural remains, and inscriptions on stones and copper–plates together with such legends in the Purāṇas and the Prabandhas as are not inconsistent with proved historical facts. This makes the Introduction well worth study in order to realise the place of Gujarat and its greatest *savant* in the history of India.

Bombay
August 22, '37

A. B. Dhruva

नमोऽस्तु हेमचन्द्राय विशदा यस्य धीप्रभा ।
विकासयति सर्वाणि शास्त्राणि कुमुदानीव ॥

—संपादकस्य.

INTRODUCTION

SYNOPSIS

13 Chālukya Rulers–Mūlarāja to Karṇa cxvi–clxii. Sources : cxvi—cxvii; How Mūlarāja got the throne ? cxviii—cxix; Mūlarāja cxix—cxxx; Copper-plate-grants cxix—cxxiii; Geneology of Mūlarāja. His connection with Śri Vyāla-kānchi. Chālukyas of Gujarat from the North or the South ? cxx—cxxii. Accounts from the Dvyāśraya, the Sukṛtasamkīrtana and the Prabandhachintāmaṇi. Wars with Grāharipu and Dvārapa cxxiii—cxxvii. Mūlarāja's Dominion cxxviii. Monuments such as Rudra-mahālaya and Important personages cxxviii—cxxx. Chāmuṇḍa & Durlabha cxxx—cxxxiv. Vīra and Virāchārya, Lalla-Śarmā, Munja etc. Monuments. Bhima I cxxxiv—cl. Sources : Copper-plate grants cxxxiv—cxxxv. Account from the D. K. A discussion on the expedition of Mohmud Gazani cxxxvi—cxxxviii. Political and cultural rivalry between Gujarat & Mālava cxxxviii-cixl. Aṇahillapura as a centre of intellectual activity: Govindāchārya, Surāchārya, Jñānadeva, Someśvara. The Suvihita monks and the Chaityavāsi monks. Śrīdhara and Śrīpati alias Jineśvara and Buddhisāgara. The Kaula poet Dharma. Śanti sūri and Muni Chandra cixl—cxlviii. Political personages, Bāla Mūlarāja. Monuments etc. cxlviii—cl. Karṇa cl—clxii. Copper-plates. His victories, etc. cl—clii. The Karṇasundarīnāṭitka clii—cliv. Karṇa's romantic marriage with Mayaṇallā, their ideal love, the birth of Jayaśimha etc. as described by the D. K. cliv—clvi; Karṇa

ऐतिह्यानि प्रमाणानि संशोध्य संगृहीतवान् ।
संभवासंभवौ तेषां परीक्ष्य च यथामति ॥

प्राप्तवानस्मि तात्पर्यमैतिहासिकवृत्तकं ।
कल्पितवानहं तस्माद् गूर्जरभूमिचित्रकम् ॥

गौरवं गूर्जरे देशे विवेकेऽसौ बृहस्पतिः ।
इति यस्याभवत् ख्यातिः स कथं चित्र्यते मया ॥

ख्यात्या तयैव किन्त्वस्मिञ्चापले प्रेरितोऽस्म्यहं ।
रेखास्खलनमत्र स्याद् वर्णिका शिथिला भवेत् ॥

प्रीयन्तां मयि विद्वांसः परीक्षणविचक्षणाः ।
यद्यत्र रुचिरं किंचिदापतेद् दृष्टिगोचरम् ॥

Critical Account of Manuscripts



The present edition of the Kāvyānuṣāsana comprises the Sūtras numbering 208, the Alamkāra-chūḍāmaṇi and the Viveka. It also includes a Saṃskṛta Ṭippaṇa gathered from the margins of the palm-leaf manuscript printed in the form of an appendix to the main text. The Sūtras and the Alaṃkārachūdāmaṇi form one work and are together referred to as Kāvyānuṣāsana, though strictly speaking, according to the colophons at the end of the manuscripts of the work, the Alaṃkārachūḍāmaṇi is a commentary on the Kāvyānuṣāsana and therefore the title Kāvyānuṣāsana should be taken to denote the Sūtras only. Viveka is a seperate work, though the name Kāvyānuṣāsana is sometimes loosely applied to it also. Hemachandra is the author of the Sūtras, the Alaṃkārachūdamaṇi—the explanatory commentary on them, and the Viveka—the exhaustive commentary on the Alaṃkārachūdamaṇi. The authorship of the Ṭippaṇa is unknown. Its contents are, probably, the notes of a student who took them down while studying the Kāvyānuṣāsana from some teacher of Poetics.

The text of the Kāvyānuṣāsana, that is, the Sūtras and the Alaṃkārachūdāmaṇi is based upon three manuscripts—one on palm-leaf and the other two on paper. They are described below.

1. P. The palm-leaf manuscript which is referred to in the text by the letter P is a manuscript from a Jaina manuscript library of Patan known as Tapā-gaccha Bhaṇḍāra. It is six hundred years old, having

been written at Cambay in V. S. 1390 i. e. 1334 A. D. This P manuscript contains two works. Its first hundred and twenty-three leaves contain the Chhandonuṣāsana—a work of Hemachandra on metrics. The Kāvyānuṣāsana begins on the leaf No. 124B and ends on the leaf 252B. There is an additional leaf attached to this manuscript which gives some Prākṛata verses which are numbered from twenty-three to twenty-seven. It is probably a loose leaf of some Prākṛta work.

Leaves: 127;—one leaf being given there numbers 232, 233, 234.

Lines divided into two lengths of about 4″ and 7″.

Length : about 14½″. Width : about 2″.

Lines per page : about 5 to 6, rarely 4.

Letters per line : about 60 or 65. Writing-measure : about 11″ × 1″ to 1½″.

There are three margins-two on sides and one in the middle having a hole in it for a string to tie the manuscript with. On the a-page of a leaf there is a red thumb-mark on the middle margin and on the b-page there are three such marks on the three margins. The leaves are numbered on the b side, the left-hand margin giving the conventional letters to indicate the number and the right-hand margin giving the figures.[1]

The Ṭippaṇa is written on these margins as well as on the upper and lower spaces of leaves, as also, sometimes, in between the lines.

---

1 For this and other interesting matter pertaining to old manuscripts see the Introduction to Sammatitarka Vol. V. edited by Pandita Sukhalal and Pandita Bechardas. See also Muni Puṇyavijayaji's article in the Jaina Chitra Kalpadruma edited and published by Mr. Sarabhai M. Navab, Ahmedabad.

Leaf 124A : Some letters are rubbed out.

Leaves 134B and 135A : ink has faded, consequently, many letters cannot be deciphered.

Leaf 172 : An oblong hole on the right-hand end of about 2″ length, not interferring with the writing; it must have been there before the leaf was written upon.

The leaves of the manuscript are on the whole in a good condition, though their right and left sides are slowly breaking; consequently, the Ṭippaṇa on those sides has suffered.

The manuscript begins : ॥ ६ □ ॥ अर्हं ॥ प्रणम्य पर-मात्मानं etc., and ends : ॥ इत्याचार्य श्रीहेमचन्द्रविरचितायामलंकारचूडा-मणिसंज्ञस्वोपज्ञकाव्यानुशासन वृ. (252b) त्तौअष्टमोऽध्यायः समाप्तः ॥ व ॥ व ॥ श्लोकसख्याग्रंथ २८०० ॥ छ ॥ सं. १३९० वर्षे चैत्र सुदि २ भौमे ॥ श्रीस्तंभतीर्थे लिखितमस्ति ॥ छ ॥ शुभंभवतु ॥ छ ॥ ६०३ ॥

2. I. This is a paper manuscript from the Bhandarkara Oriental Research Institute, Poona; it is therfore named I. It is more than five hundred years old being written in V. S. 1476 i. e. 1420 A. D.

Leaves : 117

Length about 11″; Width : about 4½″.

Lines per page : about 11.

Letters per line : about 36.

Writing bold and clear. The margins of the last twenty leaves are soiled; consequently, the numbering of the leaves cannot be read distinctly.

I begins ॥ अर्हं ॥ प्रणम्य परमात्मानं etc.

Ends : अष्टमोऽध्यायः समाप्तः ॥ ॥ समाप्तेयमलंकारचूडा-मणिवृत्तिः कृतिरियं महाकविश्रीहेमचन्द्रसूरीणां ॥ ( ) ॥ ग्रंथाग्रं श्लोक संख्या

२७३३ ॥ भग्नपृष्टिकटिग्रीवाबद्धमुष्टिरधोमुखं । कष्टेन लिखितं शास्त्रम् यत्नेन प्रतिपाल्येत् ॥ संवत १४७६ वर्षे कार्तिक वदि सप्तमी । In red ink : साहाश्रीवछाभार्या बाइ गुरुदे सुत साह सहिसकिरणेन भंडारे गृहीत्वा सुतशांतिदास परिपालनार्थं ॥ छः ॥

3. L. A paper manuscript from the Jaina Bhandāra of Limbdi in Kathiawad referred to in the text by the letter L.

Leaves : 68.

Length : $9\frac{3}{4}''$; Width : 4z.

Lines per page : about 15.

Letters per line : about 45.

Begins as usual and ends अष्टमोऽध्यायः समाप्तः

The Viveka is based upon three paper manuscripts. All the three are from a Jaina manuscript Library at Patan known as Sanghano Bhaṇḍāra. They are referred to in the text by the letters A, B, and C. A and B are written in clear and beautiful handwriting and they generally agree in their readings. C is not written so well and often differs in its readings from A and B. The three manuscripts are described below.

4. A. This manuscript is more than three hundred years old—having been written in V. S. 1668 i. e. 1612 A. D.

Leaves : 85.

Length : 10″; Width : 4·4″.

Lines per page : about 15.

Letters per line : about 55.

On the margin of the leaf 56B a figure is drawn to illustrate the verse.

A begins on 1B with an auspicious mark, then comes ॥ अर्हं ॥ विवरीतुं क्वचिद्दृब्धं etc.

Ends इत्याचार्यश्री हेमचन्द्रविर [चि] ते विवेकेऽष्टमोऽध्यायः ॥ छ ॥

ग्रंथाग्र ४००० संवत् १६६८ वर्षे आषाड वद ४ [ि]दने वारसोमे लक्षतं सुभं भवतु ॥ श्री कल्याणमस्तु ॥ ब ॥

5. B. This manuscript is also more than three hundred years old having been written in V. S. 1668 i. e. A. D. 1612 - a month before the last one.

Leaves : 84.

Length 10·4″; Width : 4·2″.

Lines per page : about 15.

Letters per line : about 51.

Some leaves in this manuscript seem to be substitutes for the older ones which were, probably soiled. B. begins like A.

Ends इत्याचार्य श्री हेमचन्द्र विरचितेविवेकेऽष्टमोध्यायः समाप्तः ॥ ब ॥ ग्रन्थाग्रं ४००० संवत् १६६८ वर्षे ज [जे] ठ सूद २ शुक्रे ॥

On the margin of the leaf 84B, in a different hand-writing, is written the word काव्यानुशासनकथा ॥. Some scribe, not knowing what the Kāvyānuśāsana was, thought it to be a kathā or a story.

6. C. This manuscript is not dated, but from its calligraphy seems to be older than A and B. Where A and B failed to give correct readings this manuscript proved very helpful.

Leaves : 79.

Length : 10″; Width : 4·4″

Lines per page : about 15.

Letters per line : about 56.

C. begins on the leaf 1B with auspicious marks. Then comes श्री गणेशाय नमः । श्री सारदायै नमः । श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः । ॥ अर्हं ॥ विवरीतुं क्वचिद्दृब्धं etc.

Ends इत्याचार्य श्री हेमचन्द्रविरचिते विवेकेऽष्टमोध्यायःसमाप्तः ॥ ब ॥ ग्रन्थाग्रं श्लोकसहस्रचत्वारि ॥ अंके ४००० ॥ ब ॥ श्री ॥ ब ॥ श्री ॥ ब ॥ श्री ॥ ब ॥ श्री ॥ शुभं भवतुः ! कल्याणं ॥

On the margin of 79B in the same handwriting अलङ्कारचूडामणि विवेको पत्र ७९.

7. N. This is the printed edition of the Kāvyānu śāsana with the Viveka, published by the Nirnaya Sāgara Press, Bombay, and referred to in the present text by the letter N. The readings of its Kāvyānuśāsana portion mostly agree with I. Viveka in the N edition is so hopelessly incorrectly printed that at several places one can make nothing of the text.[1]

The Text

In preparing the text of the Sūtras and the Alaṃkārachūdāmaṇi P has been adopted as the basis and its defects and mistakes have been corrected with help of the I, the L, and at a few places with the help of N.

The text of the Viveka is not based upon any one manuscript, because none of the three is sufficiently correct in its readings to be adopted as the basis of the text. However, providentially enough, the three together have corrected one another and provided a tolerably good text. A comparison of the Viveka of the present edition with that of the Nirnaya Sāgara will bear out this remark.

Readings other than those adopted in the present text are noted in the foot-notes. The variants of the Kāvyānuśāsana and the Viveka are numbered together consecutively. A careful persual of these

1 For other details about the manuscripts such as dropping of passages, change in the order of words, lacunae etc. see pp. 31, 34, 40, 50, 53, 54, 59, 60, 81, 96, 99, 129, 142, 156, 188, 202, 205, 260, 262, 265, 296, 302, 311, 313, 318, 321, 327, 356, 386, 404, 419, 431, 437, 466 etc. of the text.

variants will show that I have erred on the side of giving too many rather than too few. The reason is obvious: a scholar should be given as much material as possible in judging the correctness of the text and as much scope as possible in selecting his own readings. But such errors in readings as appeared unmistakably due to scribes' ignorance, or carelessness are not noted; for example, the dropping of anusvāra mark which is so usual, or the forgetting to put the top curve on long ई (see p. 4, f. n. 2), or the misplacing of refa (see p. 37. f. n. 3), or the misplacing of letters, or the changnig of order of words (p. 377) etc.[1]

In the selection of readings, as indicated above, those of P are generally given preference, though sometimes those of I which are noted in the footnotes seemed more correct (see p. 45 F. N. I for परार्थं and पदार्थ), because it is the oldest available manuscript of the Kāvyānuṣāsana. In the case of the Viveka when none of the three manuscripts gave a correct reading sometimes it had to be framed by putting the readings of A and B, and C together (see pp. 93 F. N. 3. धराधरान्तःस्थौ), or sometimes by changing the order of the letters; see for example, p. 154 where C giving मनसि, and A and B both giving मतसि, the reading adopted in the text is तमसि which was what the context required.

In addition to these six manuscripts and the Nirnaya Sāgar edition, printed editions of works which have been utilized or referred to in the Kāvyānuṣāsana and the Viveka have been consulted for the comparison of readings. The various readings of these have

1 See also pp. 56, 90, 269, 371, 426 etc.

been noted in the footnotes and some of them have, even, been adopted in the text. The Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata with the published portions of Abhinavagupta's commentary, the Kāvyādarṣa of Dandin, the Kāvya-Sutrālaṃkāra of Vāmana, the Kāvyamīmāṃsā of Rāja-śekhara, the Daśarūpaka with the Avaloka of Dhanika and other works have proved very useful in the task of guessing correct readings.[1]

As will be apparent on a persual of the pages of the Samskṛta text, the Kāvyānuṣāsana and the Viveka are printed in different types, and the Viveka is printed below the Kāvyānūṣāsana. In the Kāvyānūṣāsana, the Sūtras are printed in black types. All of them are numbered. After the end of the first adhyāya the Sūtras have two numbers, the left-hand one indicating the continuous number while the right-hand one the number in the adhyāya. These have been noted at the head of every page; e. g. p. 128: [४५) अ. २ सू. १९. Here ४५ is the continuous number while १९ is the number of the Sūtra in the second adhyāya.

All the quotations are also numbered continuously. Those that come in as illustrations are numbered in Devanāgarī figures, while those that come in as authorities are numbered in Arabic ones. Quotations in the Viveka are also numbered in the same way though separately.

I have made an attempt to trace the quotations

---

1 See the footnotes on pp. 17, 27; 64 for the Vākyapadīya and its commentary; 81, 100, 108, 141, 169, 182, 184, 197, 275, 286; for the Manusmṛti 317; 335, for a Prākṛta verse of the Mudrārākshasa quoted in Samskṛta chhāyā in the text 354; 368, 411 etc,

to their original sources. In many cases, in this trying task, such works as the Subhāshitāvalī (B. S. S.), Kavīndravachanasamuchchaya, Saduktikarṇāmṛta and others have proved very helpful. Heart-felt thanks are due to their editors. At the end of every quotation a rectangular bracket is placed and the names of the works are entered therein. Empty brackets indicate that I did not succeed in tracing the original work up to the time of printing it. Some references were found later on and are given in the addenda. I hope that the empty brackets will be handy to scholars in entering the references whenever they are traced. In the first few forms I put the names of authors as given in the Subhāshitāvalī and other works, but later on gave up the practice as misleading and only mentioned the name Su. etc.

I have, wherever possible, looked into the original works and compared the quotations with the respective passages. This has, sometimes, shown discrepancies which may drive one to interesting conclusions. For example, refer to pp. 63-64. There Bhartṛhari is referred to by name, and the verses संसर्गोविप्रयोगश्च etc. are given. Of these the first verse is found in the Benaras S. S. edition of the Vākyapadīya but not the second सामर्थ्यमौचिती etc. A careful study of the commentary of Puṇyarāja on this verse, and that of the verse No. 316 itself which contains the words औचित्य, देश etc. in the light of the quotation of the Kāvyānuṣāsana will give some interesting points for the text of the Vākyapadīya. Or refer to the page 89 where Daṇḍin is mentioned by name and a verse of his quoted; and study the footnote thereon. The verse as quoted in

2

the Kāvyānuṣāsana is not found in the Kāvyādarṣa but it can be gathered from two verses 281 - 282 of the second parichchheda of the K. D. Or study the footnotes on pp. 275 - 286 where Daṇḍin and Vāmana are often mentioned by name and compare the quotations with the original. In the case of Daṇḍin one is almost tempted to assume a Sūtra-work on Poetics different from the Kāvyādarṣa

Indexes

I have given seven indexes which are printed after the Kāvyānuṣāsana and the Viveka. The first one gives the alphabetical index of all the Saṃskṛta and Prākṛta illustrations - in verse and in prose - with the names of the works wherever found in rectangular brackets; the second one similarly gives all the authorities quoted; the third one Prākṛta verses separately with their Saṃskṛta translations; the fourth one gives all the Sūtras in the alphabetical order; the fifth one gives the names of works and authors mentioned by Hemachandra; while the sixth one gives those put in by the editor; the seventh one gives technical words, place - names and other important words, indicating only important references. In view of the fact that the Kāvyānuṣāsana - especially the Viveka - is a mine of information regarding Samskṛta Poetics, these indexes, particularly the last one, I hope, will be of some service to the students of Saṃskṛta Poetics and Poetry.

After these indexes is printed the appendix giving the Ṭippaṇa. In editing the Ṭippaṇa I have taken the liberty of emending the text at a few places.

II
Introduction to the History of Gujarat as a Back-ground to The Life & Times of Hemachandra

1

Hemachandra – the author of the Kāvyānuṣāsana – is a remarkable figure in the history of Samskṛta Literature and Learning, a conspicuous personality in the social and political history of Gujarāt and one of the greatest apostles of the Jaina Church. Like every other great man he was moulded by, as well as a moulder of, his times. He lived in an age when Gujarāt was reaching its zenith in all activities of life, in fact, in the glorious age of the history of Gujarāt. Politically, economically, and culturally Gujarāta was reaching its high watermark in the reigns of Siddharāja Jayasimha (V. S. 1150 – V. S. 1199), and Kumārpāla (V. S. 1199 – V. S. 1230) with both of whom he was in intimate contact. The intellectual and cultural life of the city of Aṇahilavāḍa Pattana was in the high tradition of Pāṭaliputra, Ujjayinī, Kānyakubja, Valabhi and Bhinnamāla. The fondness of its rulers and merchant – princes for raising architectural monuments had resulted in some of the finest temples at Aṇahilavāḍa Pattana, Moḍherā, Siddhapura, Somanātha, Arbudāchala (Mt. Abu) and many other places, and had created a whole class of master – builders who were in demand even in the South.* And these temples were not only

* See – Burgess : The Architectural Antiquities of Northern Gujarat – pp. 21 – 22. See also, references from Maṇimekhalai: in The Beginning of South Indian History : p. 137. "There is mention of a temple of the most beautiful workmanship in the same city (Puhar) built by the Gurjjars."

sanctuaries of religion; they were sanctuaries of arts also. Through a contemporary description of the temple Kumāravihāra by Rāmachandra – a worthy pupil of Hemachandra, we get a glimpse of the arts of sculpture, painting, music, dancing and play – acting as they were being fostered in these temples. All this culture had behind it the munificence of its merchant – princes whose fabulous wealth was the fruit of their sea – faring adventures. The religious outlook of the age was one of admirable toleration though now and then enlivened by the priestly rivalries of different sects.

Such a development of the life of the people had behind it its peculiar cultural history of centuries. The culture of the city of Aṇāhilavāḍa and Gurjaradeṣa in the time of Hemachandra was not the result only of its own history of centuries. As the city and the kingdom governed from it developed, it directly inherited the accumulated cultural traditions of Bhinnamāla, Valabhi, and Girinagara and indirectly those of Kānyakubja, Ujjayinī and even of Pāṭaliputra. One may say, without any fear of serious contradiction, that though the rulers were changing and causing some political disturbances, the general cultural life of Gujarāta and Mālavā together was a matter of continuous growth. It may be noted that when, in history, Gujarāta and Mālavā did not form one political unit, they often waged bitter wars against each other, and as a result, were joined together.

So, to get a clear perspective of the age in which Hemachandra lived and of his relation to it, it will not be regarded as altogether out of place if I make an attempt to present a short survey of the history of Gujarat, keeping in view cultural points and links wherever possible.

2

The philological derivation of the word Gujarāt is still a matter of controversy.* It may, however, geographically be said to occupy 'the north-east corner of the Western India.' But for historical purposes it is necessary to define it in greater detail. Following the two great authorities on the history of Gujarāt The Bombay Gazeteer Vol. 1 (hereafter referred to as the B G.) and the Rāsamālā we may define its boundaries more exactly as follows: To the North of Gujarāt is Mārwād; 'to the north-east Ābu and other outliers of Aravali range. The east is guarded and limited by rough forest land rugged in the north with wide spurs of the Vindhyas, more open towards the central natural highway from Baroda to Rutlam, and southwards again rising and roughening into the northern off-shoots from the main range of the Sātpuḍās. The southern limit is uncertain. History somewhat doubtfully places it at the Tāpti. Language carries Gujarata about a hundred miles further to Balsār and Pārḍi where forest-covered hills from the north end of the Sahyādri range stretch west almost to the sea. The Gulf of Cambay and the Arabian Sea wash its southern and south-western shores. The Gulf of Cutch and a salt and sometimes innundated desert called the Raṇa are the boundaries to the west and north-west.'

"The least protected part of this frontier line, and that by which Gujarāta has usually been invaded," says the author of the Rāsamālā, "is on the north-west,

* See the section on the Gurjaras. See also Divetia's The Gujarati Language and Literature. pp. 34 35.

where a sandy plain intervenes between the desert and the foot of Mount Ābu."

"The province includes two parts, Mainland Gujarāta or Gurjjararāshṭra and Peninsular Gujarāta the Saurāshṭra of ancient, the Kathiawar of modern history. To a total area of about 72,000 square miles Mainland Gujarāta with a length from north to south of about 280 miles and a breadth from east to west varying from 5o to 150 miles contributes 45,000 square miles; and Peninsular Gujarāta with a greatest length from north to south of 155 miles and from east to west of 200 miles contributes about 27,000 miles." (Bombay Gazetter Vol. 1; p. 1).

The use of the name of Gurjaratra, Gujarāta or Gurjaradeṣa for this whole geographical portion is, comparatively, modern. As we shall see further on the word Gurjjara itself is found first in the Harsha-charita of Bāṇa (seventh century A. D.). I shall discuss this point when we come to describe Bhinna-māla. I may be excused for the anachronism of using the name Gujarāta before it actually came into use. It must not, however, be supposed that this province had no important history before it was known as Gujarāta.

In ancient times, different parts of Gujarāta had their own names. The northern part the Mainland Gujarāta was known as Ānartta; the southern part as Lāṭa which is referred to in older Samskṛt literature as Aparānta; and the Peninsular Gujarāta was known as Saurāshṭra or Surāshṭra or Surāshṭrā. The boundaries of these districts were often changing, so it is not possible to delimit them exactly. In between Ānartta

and Lāṭa there was Ṣvabhra – the region round about the river Ṣvabhramatī or Sābarmatī. Kachchha (or Cutch) was known by this very name from ancient times. The region round about Ābu was known as Maru. So that '.........Ānartta – Surāshṭra – Ṣvabhra – Maru – Kachchha.........Aparānta.........' of the Girnar Rock Inscription of Rūdradāman of 150 A. D. practically gives us the whole of the present-day Gujarāta. Of these, references to Saurāshṭra and Āparānta in older Samskṛta literature are plenty.

References to the word Lāṭa in earlier literature are few. Lāṭas are mentioned, in the Anuṣāsanaparva of the Mahābhārata, among Kshatriya tribes. Lāṭas are also mentioned in Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra. Ptolemy (150 A. D.) refers to the province of Lāṭa by the form Larike, while the Gulf of Cambay was known as the sea of Lar, and Al Masudi (944 A. D.) calls it the Larwi sea (p. 510 the B. G.). Lāṭa is frequently mentioned in the incriptions and literature from the beginning of the fifth century* onward.

Mr. Altekar quotes a verse from the Mahābhārata which mentions Aparānta, the Paschima Samudra or the Western Sea and Prabhāsa where Arjuna made his pilgrimage. For Saurāshṭra or Surāshṭra, the B. G. Vol. I. p. 1 refers to the Mahābhārata and Pāṇini's Gaṇapāṭha. Mr. Altekar gives quotations from the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mārkaṇḍeya, the Kūrma and the Vishṇu Purāṇas, as well as from the Baudhāyana Sūtras, the grammer of Pāṇini and the Arthaṣāstra of Chāṇakya×

* See for an interesting discussion of the origin of the word Lāṭa Mr. Ratnamaṇirao Jhote's History of Cambay.

× Mr. S N. Majmudar – Sastri in his notes to the Ancient

3

For the earliest history of India we have to rely upon the traditions preserved in the Purāṇas. These sacred books, after the critical sifting done by scholars like Pargiter, are now being properly regarded as mines of historical material. As Mr. Rapson says "The Purāṇas are confessedly partly legendary and partly historical.........The descriptions of ancient monarchs and their realms are essentially historical" (Cambridge History of India Vol. 1 page 299.).

Principal Anandsamkara Dhruva, in a learned and critical lecture which he delivered under the auspices of the Gujarāta Vernacular Society in the year 1924, shows the bearing of the Purāṇas on the early history of Gujarāta. Ānartta is the first province that comes to our view in the Purāṇic traditions. As noted by Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji the Vishṇupurāṇa gives the longest account; the one given in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa agrees with it and the Matsyapurāṇa and the Harivamṣa also refer to it. Ṣaryāti a son of Manu Vaivasvata was given the south-west portion of India. Ānartta a son of Ṣaryāti established a kingdom which according to the Purāṇas was known after him as Ānarttadeṣa. Principal Dhruva, however, suggests another derivation which accords with the history of the province. It is that this province was called Ānartta because it was inhabited by Dasyus who did not follow the Ṛta

Geography of India by Cunningham refers Valabhi to Pāṇini's Gaṇapāṭha, while Mr. C. V. Vaidya refers Mahīnagara a city on the banks of the river Mahī also to the same source. It is, however, a question whether the references are by Pāṇini himself or are later additions.

– that is the cult of sacrifice – yajṇadharma – of the Brāhmaṇas, and therefore would be called Anṛtas – or Ānarttas by the northern Āryans. Ānarttapura which is an older name of Ānandapura (that is modern Vadnagara) might have been founded in these early times and become the first centre of Āryan religion and culture in this part of the country. Probably it was this city which kept the light of Vedic learning and culture burning throughout the later history of this province as is attested by the grants of the Valabhi kings aud other successive rulers of Gujarāta. Even to-day the Vadanagarā Nāgara Brāhmaṇas or Nāgaras, as the aristocrats among them would call themselves, are known to maintain a certain standard of traditional Brahmaṇic culture.

Revata the successor of Ānartta made Kuṣasthalī or Dwārakā in Saurāshṭra his capital and from there governed the country called Ānartta. We thus find Ānartta and Surāshṭra joined together from very early times. As we shall see later on in the inscription of Rudradāman in the phrase 'Ānartta-Surāshṭrāṇām' the provinces were looked upon as connected with each other.

This Revata had a son who was called Raivata. He or more probably one of his descendants who was called Raivata Kakudmi was attacked by the Yādavaṣ from the sea who ultimately became the rulers of Saurāshṭra.

The descendants of Revata would be known according to an usage of the Samskṛta language as Raivatas *

* One of the older names of the mount Girnāra is Raivataka which is described under that name by the great poet Māgha of Bhinnamāla in his Sisupālavadha canto IV.

One of these who was known as Raivata Kakudmi had a daughter named Revatī who was married to Baladeva–the elder brother of Śrī Kṛshṇa. The love of Revatī and Baladeva is immortalised by Kālidāsa in the beautiful phrase–'Revatī–lochanānkām' of the Megha-dūta. This Raivata, according to the Purāṇas, had lost his kingdom before he married his daughter to Baladeva. This may mean that one of the Raivatas was attacked by the Yādavas, probably from the sea, who ultimately usurped the kingdom of the Raivatas but legalised their position by marrying one of them to a princess of the royal family that preceded them.

The Raivatas being descended from Manu Vaivasvata or Manu–the son of the Sun–would naturally be regarded as of the Solar race. Pargiter regards the Solar race as originally non–Aryan, while the Lunar race as Aryan. Principal Dhruva, rightly, points out that this view is altogether imaginary and has no basis in tradition and is contradicted by the oneness of the culture of the Solar and the Lunar races.

The Yādavas were the descendants of Yadu, and essentially Āryan in their blood. Aila Purūravas, who was supposed to be descended from the Moon (and who is the hero of the famous play of Kālidāsa—Vikramorvaṣīya), had a son named Āyu who married a daughter of the Dānava Svarbhānu–a non–Āryan. Thus the Yādavas had an admixture of Drāvidian blood in them.

One branch of the Yadu–family, separate from the main Yādavas, was known as Haihaya. The famous hero Sahasrārjuna Kārtavīrya belonged to this race. He conquered the city of Māhishmatī on the banks of the

Narmadā from Karkoṭaka Nāga. He was a powerful king who defeated even Rāvaṇa of Lankā. He was a disciple of the famous sage Dattātreya, and is reported to have performed ten thousand sacrifices. According to the Purāṇic tradition Kārtavīrya and the whole clan of Haihayas * were killed by Paraśurāma the son of Bhṛgu.

The modern city of Broach whose Saṃskṛta equivalent is Bhṛgu-kachchha which literally means the coast of Bhṛgus, bears the imprint of Bhṛgus at least in its name. × The society formed for research into the Narmadā valley will, let us hope, throw more light on the early history of this part of Gujarāt.

Purāṇas give a detailed account of the different Yādava families which are also constantly mentioned in Jaina literature. The principal families were those of Vṛshṇi, Kukkura, Bhoja, Sātvata, Andhaka, Madhu, Surasena, and Daśārha. In the family of Sātvata who was thirty-seventh from Yadu, Śrī Kṛshṇa was born. It was in his time that Yādavas had to leave Mathurā on the Yamunā. They subsequently settled in Saurāshṭra and established themselves as its rulers, probably supplanting the Raivatas.

Ugrasena was a leading Yādava chief who had the co-operation of the families of Yadu, Bhoja and Andhaka. His principal seat was either at Dwārakā or at Raivatanagara or Ugrasenapura, that is, modern Junāgadh. Śri Kṛshṇa and Baladeva were very influential

* According to a verse in the Prabandhachintāmaṇi Chāvaḍas belonged to the Haihaya dynasty. See the section on Chāvaḍas.

× Buddhists give a different explanation. See S. N. Majumdar's edition of Cunningham's Ancient Geography.

persons. They were related to the Pāṇḍavas through their paternal aunt. Arjuna looked upon Śri Kṛshṇa as his guide, friend and philosopher. The coming of Arjuna to Aparānta, and the right royal reception that Kṛshṇa and other Yādavas gave him is described in the Mahābhārata Ādiparvan-chapters 218-221. The romance of Subhadrā and Arjuna—their falling in love at a festival and their subsequent marriage in Girnār is beautifully described in the same work. According to the author of the B. G. "The large fair still held in the west Girnār valley near the modern temple of Bhavanātha is perhaps a relic of this great Yādava fair." (p. 10).

When Ṣrī Kṛshṇa had gone to Indraprastha to attend the Rājasūya sacrifice of Yudhiṣṭhira, where he subsequently killed Ṣiṣupāla - the king of Chedis, Dwārakā was attacked by Ṣālva-the king of Mṛttikāvatī in the country of Ṣvabhra, that is, the region about the river Sābaramatī-the present-day Sābarakānṭhā. When Ṣrī Kṛshṇa returned, he met Ṣālva in battle near the seashore and defeated him and killed him.

The going of Ṣri Kṛshṇa to Indraprastha and the killing of Ṣiṣupāla forms the subject-matter of the Ṣiṣupālavadha, the Mahākāvya of Māgha-a poet of Ṣrīmāla or Bhinnamāla one of the ancient capitals of Gujarat. The romance of Subhadrā and Arjuna is the subject-matter of the Naranārāyaṇānanda the Mahākāvya of the minister Vastupāla.

Thirty-six years after the war of Kurukshetra the glory of the Yādavas was extinguished. The principal cause was the family feud, the excessive addiction to

drinking unbalancing the clan-mind already excited by other causes.

Here I may mention the Jaina tradition about Arishṭanemi who became the twenty-second Tīrthaṁkara, as preserved in the twenty-second adhyayana of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra-a canonical work of the Ṣvetāmbara Jainas. It mentions two Yādava kings Vasudeva and Samudravijaya who are evidently brothers, in the city of Soriyapura (a place near Mathurā). Vasudeva had two queens Rohiṇī and Devakī whose sons were Rāma and Keṣava respectively. Samudravijaya had a queen named Ṣivā whose son was Arishṭanemi. Samudravijaya had another son Rathanemi or Raṭhanemi after whom this adhyayana or chapter is named. (The commentators refer to the intervening events,-the fleeing away from Soriyapura and the coming to Dwārakā of these Yādavas who are mentioned as belonging to the Andhakavṛshnī family.) When Arishṭanemi becomes of age Keṣava asks for Arisṭanemi the hand of the beautiful damsel Rāymatī-or Rājamatī who calls herself the daughter of Bhojarāja (according to the commentators Ugrasena a Yadava prince who was ruling in Junāgaḍha). The match is settled, and as the marriage procession, with Arishṭanemi on the best elephant-gandhahastin-of Vāsudeva (evidently of Ṣri Kṛshṇa) is proceeding to the house of the bride's father, Arishṭanemi discovers the pitiable conditions of the animals which are pēnned in pounds and cages and which are to be slaughtered far his marriage-feast. His heart is filled with emotion and he thinks of renouncing the world which he does ultimately without marrying Rājamatī. Rājamatī, on

hearing this, being filled with grief, renounces the world also and becomes a nun. As she is proceeding to Raivataka mountain for practicing penance she has to stop on the way on account of heavy rains. As she is drying her nun's garments she is caught sight of by Rathanemi the brother of Arishṭanemi who was also practising penance in the jungle. He is enamoured of her beauty and requests her to be his wife. Rājamatī peremptorily refuses his demand and reminds him of his high and noble traditions, of their respective families and advises him to be of a steady mind and not to go after every woman that he meets and consequently lose the merits of his penance. Rathanemi is cured of his infatuation. (To describe this purification is the purpose of narrating this episode in the 22nd chapter of the Uttarādhyayana)

4

Leaving the Purāṇic traditions, we come to the more authentic period of inscriptions, coins, references of foreigners, and semi-historical literary accounts of the Jainas and others. Before we discuss this, a few words may be said about the maritime activity of Gujarat. As a glance at the map of India will show Gujarat has a goodly part of sea-coast to its credit. In fact the main part of Gujarat is scarcely a hundred miles away from the sea-coast. Naturally, the people living in Ānartta, Saurāshṭra, and Lāṭa were more sea-faring than the people living in the interior of India. We find history corroborating this. Mr. Hewitt would carry the history of the sea-borne commerce of Gujarat to 3000-6000 B. C. Mr. Jackson in the B. G. Appendix IV in a footnote (p. 492) summarises

'the available evidence of Gujarat Hindu enterprise by sea', which gives a good idea of the maritime activity of Gujarat in the last two thousand years.

In fact the main cause of the fabulous wealth of Gujarat was not so much the fertility of its land, as the commercial enterprise of her people. Yuan Chang has noted this in case of Bharucha and Valabhi and we find the author of Nābhinandanoddhāraprabandha saying in so many words that all people risiding in Gujarat make lot of money with little effort on its many sea-coasts.

यन्निवासी जनः सर्वो वेलाकूलेषु भूरिषु ।
व्यवसाये कृतेऽल्पेऽपि निःसीमश्रियमश्नुते ॥ ना. प्र. प्रस्ताव २, श्लो. ४८.

In this connection, mention may be made of the colonising activity of Gujarat.

It appears, from the traditions preserved in the Mahāvaṃśa and the Dīpavaṃśa, that Ceylon owes its name Siṃhaladvīpa, its language Siṃhalese and its aryanisation to a prince named Vijaya the son of the king Simhabāhu who reigned at Simhapura in Lāḷa or Lāṭa-a name by which Gujarat was often referred to by foreigners. According to Dr. L. D. Barnett, the Aryan immigration started from Sīhapura in Lāṭa (possibly the modern Sihor, in Kathiawar) and Sopārā. The latter band belonged to the Simhalas (Sīhalas) or 'Lion-tribe' and it was probably they who imposed their Aryan tongue on Ceylon. 'The landing of Vijaya is made to coincide with the decease of Gāutama Buddha in 483 B. C.' (Cambridge History of India Vo. I pp. 605-607]. *

---

* Mr. Ratnamaṇirao Jhote in an illuminating article on the 'Shipping of Gujarat' has very ably controverted the view of Prof. Radhakumud that Prince Vijaya started from

Colonisation of Jāvā, by a prince of Gujarāt, which took place, according to the Javanese tradition in the beginning of the seventh century A. D. may, also, be mentioned here. According to Mr. Jackson this is an incident which "redeems the early history of Gujarāt from provincial narrowness and raises its ruling tribes to a place among the greater conquerors and colonisers. This incident is the tradition that during the sixth and seventh centuries fleets from the coasts of Sindh and Gujarāta formed settlements in Jāvā and in Cambodia. The Jāvā legend is that about 603 A. D. Hindus led by Bhr̄ vijaya Savelāchala the son of Kasamachitra or Balya Acha king of Kujrāt or Gujarāta settled on the west coast of the island" (p. 489). Discussing the probability of this incident Mr. Jackson says "During the last two thousand years the record of the Gujarāta coast shows a genius for seafaring fit to ensure the successful planting of north-west India in the Malay Archipelago." (p. 492).

---

the coast of Bengal. One convincing argument against Prof. Radhakumud's viewis provided by the account of the voyage which makes Vijaya stop at the port of Sopara near Bombay. This would be quite natural if he started from some port on the Gulf of Cambay but very absurd if he sailed from some port on the Bay of Bengal. The connection of Gujarat and Ceylon is suggested in many folk-stories and sayings in Gujarati and also in a Jaina work called Vividha-tīrtha-Kalpa, in which a temple at Bharucha known as Ṣakunikāvihāra is said to be built by a Simhali princess. For a different view see Mr. Sengar's article in the Indian Historical Quarterly Vol. III, pp. 403-8, 1927. Mr. Sengar's theory is that Prince Vijaya belonged to the Ṣengar clan of Rajputs and that his original home was Rāḍha North East India.

From the end of the Yādava supremacy in Saurāshṭra to the rise of the Mauryan empire, there is a blank in our knowledge of the history of Gujarāt. Possibly Yaudheyas × Ābhiras, and such other tribes were contending for supremacy. Yādavas were also there But we do not know of any definite event unless we accept the historicity of Prince Vijaya embarking from the coast of Lāṭa and conquering the island afterwards known as Siṃhaladvīpa and establishing an Āryan kingdom there. This, as we have seen before, coincides with the death of Gautama Buddha. This takes us to the 5th century B. C..

5

The earliest monuments of history that we have as yet discovered in Gujarāt are those on a rock in the mountains of Girināra. This conic granite about twelve feet high from the ground and having a circumference of about 75 feet in its lower part is situated on a narrow path leading to a valley, a mile to the east of the city of Junāgaḍha in Kathiawar. It has three documents of the first class historical importance inscribed on it. As a monument of history its importance can scarcely be exaggerated. In fact it is unique for the history of India. It bears side by side inscriptions of the three kings – greatest in the history of India: Aṣoka, Rudradāman and Skandagupta. This is the only monument which in the inscription of Rudradāman contains, according to Vincent Smith, 'the only known epigraphic record containing the names of Chandragupta and Aṣoka Maurya' (E. H. I. p. 133).

× For information regarding the coins of Yaudheyas, their democratic constitution, etc. see the B. G. pp. 19 and 36, 37.

The oldest record on this rock is the ' Dhammalipi ' of Aṣoka giving his code of fourteen regulations in the Prākṛta language. The second commemorates the repairs done by Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman to the lake Sudarṣana (meaning ' good to look at '), constructed by Pushyagupta – the governor of Gujarāt appointed by Chandragupta Maurya, which had become ' durdarṣana ' (' not good to look at '), the dam having crashed on account of the huge floods of Girnar rivers. The third commemorates a similar event three centuries later,– the floods having again damaged the lake, the repairs this time being done by Skandagupta of the Gupta dynasty.

These three inscriptions – of Aṣoka, Rudradāman and Skandagupta–carry us respectively to the periods 274 – 237 B. C. (C. H. I Vol. I p. 698), 150 A. D. and 456 A. D. (E. H. I. 3rd. edition). Thus we find that we are given a glimpse in the past history by the inscription of Rudradāman, which discovers Gujarāt to be a province of Chandragupta Maurya (274–237 B. C.). Girinagara was then probably the provincial capital; while ' the southern capital of the Mauryas seems to have been Sopārā ' (the B. G. p. 14). The governor of the province was one Pushyagupta. He belonged to the Vaiṣya caste and probably was a brother of one Chandragupta's queens. He, it was, who first built the Lake Sudarṣana or the Lake Beautiful, near the city of Girinagara, probably at the foot of the mountain Ūrjayat – as Girnar was then known. It was primarily meant for irrigation purposes. Being a ' Jalāṣaya ' or an ' abode of waters ' it must have become a sacred place, as all such places generally become in India. This Lake Beautiful must also have been a place of

recreation and diversion to the citizens of Girinagara, and the pilgrims from the rest of India. It is worthwhile emphasizing this point; for it was a regular feature of the ancient civic life of this land. The tradition of having a large and beautiful lake near a city for irrigational, religious and recreative purposes was maintained in Gujarāt through the munificence of its kings and merchant-princes who thought it an act of religious merit to construct such 'abodes of waters'; and one may say, in the Lake Siddhasaras or Sahasralinga of Siddharāja Jayasimha, near Aṇahilavāḍa Pāṭaṇa, the tradition was revealed in its most magnificent and beautiful form.

The following remarks of Vincent Smith gives a good idea of the irrigation works in the time of Chandragupta Maurya:—

"The proper regulation of irrigation is a matter of prime importance in India; and it is much to the credit of Chandragupta that he maintained a special Irrigation Department charged with the duty of measuring the lands and so regulating the sluices that every one should receive his fair share of the life-giving water. The allusion to the measurement of lands as part of the duty of the Irrigation Department indicates that a water-rate must have been levied, and the reference to sluices implies a regular system of canals.

The inscription of Satrap Rudradāman,...........bears direct testimony to the care bestowed by the central government upon the question of irrigation, even in the most remote provinces. Although Girnar is situated close to the Arabian Sea, at a distance of at least 1,000 miles from the Maurya capital, the needs of the local farmers did not escape the imperial notice." (E. H. I. p. 132)

The Arthaṣāstra, whose authorship is attributed to Vishṇugupta Chāṇakya - the prime minister of Chandragupta Maurya, throws some side - light on Surāshṭra and Aparānta in the time of Mauryas. In those days, we learn from it, there were Ṣreṇīs - guilds - of Kshatriyas and others in Surāshṭra and Kāmbhoja who followed the profession of 'Vārttā' that is agriculture, breeding of cattle, and commerce, and 'Ṣastra' that is arms. This description of the war - like tribes of Kathiawar agrees well with their historical profession almost to the end of the 19th century. This may also very well refer to the Yādavas, Yaudheyas, Ābhiras etc. who must have been then in possession of Surāshṭra.

Elephants were a very important part of the army in Ancient India. In fact, according to the Arthaṣāstra - 'the successes of the kings principally depended upon the elephants.' In this context we find that elephants from Aparānta or west coast were of middle size, while the Saurāshṭra elephants were of smaller size.

When discussing the question of the amount of rain necessary for good crops in different parts of India the Arthaṣāstra says 23 droṇas-(rain was measured by a droṇa) - are necessary for Avanti, but for Aparānta the amount is 'amita', that is, unmeasured or unknown.

When giving information on the best variety of cotton, the Arthasāstra mentions Aparānta cotton next to Madhurā cotton, that is, Madurā cotton. Broach cotton is still famous and rates of cotton in Indian markets are quoted even to - day in terms of Broach.

After Chandragupta Maurya comes the Great Aṣoka. In his time also Gujarat was a province of the Maurya empire, and Girinagara continued to be the capital. On behalf of Asoka, the inscription of Rudradāman tells us, his governor Yavanarāja Tushasfa, who in spite of the title Yavanarāja is regarded as a Persian by scholars on account of his name, 'adorned the lake with the supplementary channels in a right royal style.'

The most important event of Gujarāt history of this period, however, is the inscribing of the 'Dhammalipi' of Aṣoka, on the rock of the mountain Ūrjayat or Girnāra referred to in the beginning of this section. The civilizing influence of this royal edict cannot be exaggerated. It inculcated the very essence of Aryadharma – of Aryan civilization as it developed in India – a fusion, no doubt, of many influences.

The first edict gives the injunction to abstain from taking life either for sacrificial offerings or for sport. And the emperor himself sets an example by cutting down the slaughter of thousands of animals for the royal kitchen to three animals, and in future even stopping this.

The second edict describes the provision for medical treatment of human beings and animals, planting of medicinal plants, and the building of wells and planting of trees on roads for the benefit of human beings and animals. The third refers to the appointment of officers who will travel in the different parts of the empire to see that the people practice the 'dharma', and that the people regard it as good to attend to their parents properly, to treat hospitably

friends, acquaintances, relatives, Brāhmaṇas and Ṣramaṇas, to abstain from taking life and not to be extravagant and not to be hoarding. The fourth describes what was the state of affairs in these matters formerly, what this Beloved of gods has done and what his successor will abide by. The fifth edict has also similar import. The sixth one proclaims his ever-readiness for doing good to the people and his easy approachability to his subjects. The seventh shows that mere giving of money in charity is nothing without self-restraint, purity of heart, feeling of gratitude and firm devotion. The eigth edict tells that formerly kings used to go out for hunting but that now the Beloved of gods travels for 'dharma,' to pay his respects and give gifts to Brāhmaṇas, Ṣramaṇas and the elders, to see people in villages and discuss matters of 'dharma' with them.

The ninth edict asks women to abstain from frivolous and meaningless ceremonies, to treat properly their servants, to honour the elders, to behave with restraint towards animals and to give gifts to Brāhmaṇas and Ṣramaṇas. Fathers, brothers, and husbands are asked to instruct their women-folk accordingly. The tenth and the eleventh edicts insist upon dharma.

The twelfth edict advises toleration of all sects and respect for all religions. People are asked to practise restraint of speech in praising their sects and finding fault with those of others. This particular edict is the most noteworthy and gives us an idea of the liberal culture of the emperor.

The thirteenth edict which on the Girnār rock is

much mutilated insists upon the practice of essentials of all religions. The fourteenth refers to the form of dhammalipis.

This brief summary would help our imagination to realise how it must have affected the very depths of the springs of human action. There can be no record of the results of such mental processes - either in individuals or groups. But that its effect must have been immense admits of no doubt. Two tendencies to be observed in the mass of Gujarāt people through their history - one feeling a sort of repulsion to killing animals, and the other feeling no particular antipathy towards people of different religious persuasions - owe their development not a little to this influence. The sentiment of Ahimsā - non-violence - towards animals was no doubt fostered by the Jaina influence, and the attitude of toleration must have proved a very useful equipment of mind to a commercial people.

Gujarāt had another emperor of Aṣoka's type in Kūmārapāla (12 cen. A. D.) who used his royal influence to spread dharma.

Immediate succession after Aṣoka is not definitely known. The inscriptions of the cave at the Bara'ber hill near Gayā and at the Nāgārjuna hill bear testimony to the succession of Dasaratha - probably a grandson. The caves are dedicated to the Ājīvaka sect. Another successor of Aṣoka was Samprati. Though there is no epigraphic evidence of his existence * he is mentioned in the Brāhmaṇic, Buddhist and Jaina traditions. According to the Jaina tradition he was converted to Jainism by the Sthavira Suhastin, and was a builder of

* Mr. Jayswal identifies some coins as those of Samprati.

innumerable temples – so much so that a newly discovered Jaina idol or an old Jaina temple whose builder is unknown is attributed to him. He is specially mentioned as a king of Ujjayinī ruling Western India, and one who had propagated Jaina faith even in Anārya countries. Considering the fact that Jainism found a strong foot-hold in Western India and Gujarāt the tradition should be regarded as embodying historical reality. Samprati's reign probably ended by about 197 B. C. – if we accept 237 – 36 B. C. as the year of Aṣoka's death and accept 40 years' interval as given by the Purāṇas.

V

From about 180 B. C. to 100 B. C. we find traces of Bactrian-Greek sway in Saurāshṭra and Kachchha. Our main sources of information are the Bactrian-Greek coins found in Kathiawar and some references in Greek and Roman writers. Of these Bactrian-Greek rulers the most noteworthy is Menander. We find a helmated bust of this king with a Greek legend round it on the obverse of his coins, while on the reverse we find a figure of Athene Promachos with the Bactro-Pali legend 'Mahārājasa Tradatasa Menandrasa.' The reference to camps, temples and wells by the author of the Periplus as those of Alexander is incorrect. The camps, temples and wells must have been those of Menander. He is the Milinda of the Milindapanhā – a Pali treatise in the form of a dialogue on the Buddhist philosophy. The dialogue is between Milinda and Nāgasena who solves his questions and converts his royal antagonist to Buddhism.

The last Bactrian - Greek ruler that we know of was Apolodotus whose coins have the legend in Bactro-Pali characters : 'Mahārājasa Tradatasa Apaladatasa.' After Apollodotus, to the end of the first century A. D., there is a blank in our knowledge of the history of Gujarāt.

7

On the strength of the information derived from a great number of coins mainly discovered and interpreted by Dr. Bhagawanlal Indraji, a few inscriptions, and references from foreign writers, we are again able to construct the history of Gujarāta for three centuries and more. This is the period known as the Kshatrapa period. The coins and inscriptions are now proved to have been dated in the era which starts from the beginning of Kanishka's reign in 78 A. D. As Prof. Rapson says these coins and inscriptions " range from the year 41 to the year 310 (119-388 A. D.) and form the most continuous and complete chronological series found on the monuments of ancient India. It was in consequence of its long use by the Ṣaka princes of Western India that the era became generally known in India as the Ṣaka era..." (C. H. I. Vol. I p. 585.).

Amongst the Kshatrapas, we have to distinguish between two dynasties - the Kshaharātas and the line of Chashṭana. The word Kshatrapa appears under three forms Chhatrapa, * Chhatrava and Khatapa, while Kshaharāta appears under the form Chhaharāta in Prākṛta legends on the coins. Acording to Mr. Jackson

* May not the title Chhatrapati be a sanskritization of this word ?

" Kshatrapa was originally a Persian title adopted by the Greeks and continued in use among their successors; it originally denoted a provincial governor; but when the Greek kingdom broke up and their provincial chiefs became independent, it continued in use as a royal title. " (B. G. p. 22.)

Nahapāna was the first Kshatrapa ruler of Gujarāt and Saurāshṭra. He belonged to Kharosṭhi family. It is not certain whether he made his conquests as a general of Kanishka or independently on his own account. His advance is traced as lying ' through East Rajputānā by Mandasor in West Mālwā along the easy route to Dohad as far as South Gujarāt. From South Gujarāt his power spread in two directions by sea to Kathiawad and from near Balsar by the Dang passes to Nasik and the Deccan, over almost the whole of which, judging from coins and inscriptions, he supplanted as overlord the great Āndhra kings of the Deccan " (B. G. p. 24). It is not known whether Nahapāna was also ruling over Ujjain and East Malwa and north Gujarāt also. According to Vincent Smith his capital might have been at Nasik, though there is no definite information on the point.

The Bactro - Greek legend on the three of the four coins found by Dr. Bhagawanalal Indraji is Raño Chhaharātas Nahapānasa, on the fourth is simply ' Raño Chhaharātas. The Nāgari legend on all the four is Raño Kshaharātas Nahapānasa '. On the obverse of the coins there is a bust, presumably, of Nahapāna. Of the four coins one gives the youthful image, one old, and the remaining two represent intervening stages of life. " The dress of the bust is in the style of the

overdress of Nahapāna's time. The bust, facing the right, wears a flat grooved cap and has the hair combed in ringlets falling half – down the ear. The neck shows the collar of the coat." (B. G. p. 24).

In addition to Nahapāna's coins there are, at Nasik and Karla, the inscriptions of Uṣāvadāta – his son-in-law and at Junnar, of Ayama – his minister which give us valuable information about him. His title of Kshatrapa which is not found in his coins is mentioned in Uṣāvadāta's inscriptions in which he is called Ksharāta Kshatrapa Nahapāna. We find the charitable acts of Uṣāvadāta described in some of these inscriptions. Those that pertain to Gujarāt are – the building of ' riverside steps at the Barṇāsa or Banās river near Mount Abu '; the giving away in marriage, which included the expenses of the ceremony, of eight Brāhmaṇa brides, at Prabhāsa in Saurāshṭra; the building of rest – houses and alms – houses at Broach; of waiting–places and steps on both the banks of the Tāpti and other rivers and also the providing of free ferries to cross them, etc.

According to the B. G., Nahapāna on his conquest of Gujarāt and West Deccan founded the era which is known as the Ṣaka era and which corresponds to 78 A. D.. On the subsequent coins and inscriptions of Kshatrapas, it is according to this era, that the years are given.

Nahapāna had no son. He was succeeded, probably, by his son-in-law Uṣāvadāta. Soon after, however, the Kshaharāta satraps were destroyed by Gautamīputra Ṣātakarni – an Andhra king. His inscription at Nasik mentions Surāshṭra and Aparānta as parts of his

dominion. This event is dated by the B. G. in 138 A. D. but in or about 126 A. D. by Vincent Smith.

In the meanwhile another Kshatrapa comes on the stage. His name was Chashṭana. He soon wins back the portions of Gujarāt taken by Gautamīputra.

The family of this Kshatrapa is not connected in any way with Kshaharāta Nahapāna. Some of Chashṭana's coins bear the legend Rajno Kshatrapasa Ysmotikaputrasa Chashṭanasa, while others bear 'Rajno Mahākshatrapasa Ysmotikaputrasa Chashṭanas. We gather from this that his father's name was Ysmotika or Zamotika which appears to be a foreign word. His father must have been an ordinary man as no title is prefixed to his name. Another thing that we understand from the legends is that in the beginning Chashṭana was only a Kshatrapa and later on became a Mahākshatrapa. When he was a simple Kshatrapa his dominion must have extended only to Malwa and North Gujarāt. He is identified with Tiastanes of Ptolemy who gives Ozene or Ujjayinī as his capital. He must have called himself Mahākshatrapa after winning back Saurāshṭra and Aparānta from the Andhra kings.

Chashṭana became the founder of a great dynasty and had at least twentyfive or twentysix successors. His name is mentioned in the inscriptions of some of his successors.

We may imagine his appearance from the busts on his coins. "He wears a moustache, the cap is not grooved but plain, and the hair which reaches the neck is longer than Nahapāna's hair." In one of his coins the hair seems dressed in ringlets.

His coins have the symbol of the sun and the crescent moon.

Chashṭana was succeeded by Jayadāman who calls himself only a Kshatrapa in his coins which are very rare. Barring the names of Chashṭana and Ysamotika which sound foreign, the names of the rest of the Kshtrapas are purely Indian. ×

Jayadāman was succeded by Rudradāman. He was, to judge from what we know, the greatest of the Kshatrapas and one of the greatest kings that ruled over Gujarāt. " His beautiful silver coins, in style much like those of Chastana, are frequently found in Kathiawada. On the obverse is his bust in the same style of dress as Chastana's " (B. G. p. 34). The coins bear the following legend in Nāgarī characters: ' Rajno Kshtrapasa Jayadāmaputrasa Rajno Mahākshatrapasa Rudradāmasa. '

We had occasion to refer to his famous inscription on the Girnār rock. It gives us details which testify to his greatness as a powerful, cultured and benevolent ruler. His reign, in all likelihood, seems to have lasted for more then forty years. * He himself earned the

× Dāmājaḍaṣrī also appears foreign.

* Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji supposed the beginning of the reign of Rudradāman to be in the year 65 and the end of his reign in the year 80. Mr. Jackson carries his reign upto 95 in order to give him atleast 30 years' reign Only one date — that of the year 72 of the rock inscription was known to them. But four other inscriptions of Rudradāman's reign found later, mention the year 52. This in itself gives 20 years' reign to Rudradāman. The abundance of his coins and the scarcity of the coins of his on and grand-son make Mr. Jackson give

title of Mahākshatrapa, which was enjoyed by his grand - father but not by his father who was only a Kshatrapa. Through his own prowess he had become the lord of Akara - Avanti, Anūpa, Ānartta, Surāshṭra, Ṣvabhra, Maru, Kachchha, Sindh - Sauvīra, Kakura, Aparānta, Nisāda etc. with all their former cities, business towns, and villages; that is, roughly, of the 'country from Bhilsā in the east to Sindh in the west, and from Mount Ābu in the north to the North Konkan in the south including the peninsulas of Kathiawad and Cutch' - in short of Western India. He had humbled the pride of Yaudheyas who had become puffed because they were called Vīra - Valorous - by all Kshatriyas. He had twice defeated Ṣātakarni the lord of Dakshiṇāpatha, but, because he was a near relative (a son-in-law), he was not uprooted. This consideration earned for him public appreciation. He was famed for his mastery in the science and art of Ṣabda-Language, Artha-Politics, Gāndharava-Music and Dancing, and Nyāya-Logic. So also was he proficient in the manly and military arts of riding and managing horses elephants and chariots, of duelling, of fencing with the sword and the like. He was a master of

Rudradāman a reign of 30 years. According to our new calculation it would take Rudradāman's reign upto the year 82, that is, 160 A. D. One coin of his grand-son bears the year 100—the earliest date found on Kshatrapa coins - that is, the year 178 A. D. How many years should be allowed to his son Dāmājaḍaṣrī is a question; but 28 years' reign appears to be too long for him. If we allow him only five years, as Mr. Jackson does, his reign will extend to the year 95, that is, 173 A. D. This would give in all 43 years' reign to Rudradāman. There is nothing improbable in such a supposition.

fine speech in prose as in verse. His body was strong and proportionate; he had a fine figure. He was chosen in marriage by many princesses.

All the Varṇas-castes or communities-approached him and elected him as their king for his merits. He made cities, business-places and villages safe from robbers, beasts of prey, wild animals and disease. He had vowed not to kill men except equal foes met in battle.

The inscription gives a graphic picture of the rain-storm and the floods in the Suvarṇa-sikatā, the Palāśinī and other rivers of the mountain Ūrjayat and the havoc they had worked with the lake. 'The rains had made the whole earth one sea of waters. The dam was broken by the velocity of the floods. The wind had toppled down the peaks of the mountain, uprooted the trees, and destroyed the banks, aṭṭālaka (top-rooms on fortifications), upatalpa (upper-story), dvāra(entrances), and śaraṇa (chambers). It was, as if, the wind of the day of destruction. The flowing away of all the water made the Lake Sudarṣana appear as if it were a sandy desert-painful to look at. There was left a gaping chasm 420 Hastas in length and 420 in breadth and 75 Hastas deep.

'The task of re-building a lake with such a huge chasm was staggering. His ministers and officers had not the energy to face it. So they advised the Mahākshtrapa to leave it alone. When the people saw that the dam was not to be re-built they raised a hue and a cry. One minister-Suviṣākha the Pahlava - son of Kulaipa who was appointed at that place the governor of Ānartta-Saurāshṭra by the king undertook to execute the task for the benefit of the city and

the village. The new dam was thrice as strong and thrice as long and wide as the old one. Huge amounts of money were spent after the work. But the people were not harassed with new taxes or forced labour. The whole work was finished promptly and the lake Sudarṣana – that is, beautiful–was made Sudaıṣanatara more beautiful.' ×

Suviṣākha – the Pahlava deserves notice. He is described as an ideal officer in the inscription. He must be a Persian settled in Gujarat. According to the B. G. " This trade connection between the Persian Gulf and the Western Sea–board must have led to the settlement from very early times of the Pahlavas who gradually became converted to Buddhism, and like the Pārasis their modern enterprising representatives, seem to have advanced in trade and practical influence " (P. 35).

The incriptions from Cutch of the year 52, that is, 130 A. D. enable us to infer the spread of Buddhism in these parts *

× This inscription of 150 A. D. mentions the original builders of the lake Chandragupta and Aṣoka of the 4th century B. C. It seems there were other inscriptions nearby upon which the author of this inscription might have relied.

* The four other inscriptions of the year 52 in the reign of Rudradāman are in connection with the memorials raised in memory of dead relatives. Three of them are raised by Madana son of Sīhila, one, in memory of his sister Jeshṭavīrā; another, in memory of his brother Ṛshabhadeva; and the third, in memory of his wife Yaṣadatā–daughter of Sīhamita. Yaṣadatā is called Ṣāmaṇeri – that is, a woman Buddhist disciple. The fourth is raised by Treshṭadata – a Ṣrāmaṇera in memory of his son Ṛshabhadeva.

After Rudradāman there were about twenty-two kings some of whom were Mahākshatrapas while the rest were Kshatrapas. Rudradāman was succeeded by his son Dāmājadasrī who was succeeded by his son Jīvadāman. But Jīvadāman appears to have been deposed soon after he came to the throne by his uncle Rudrasimha I. Of the time of Rudrasimha we have one inscription from the village of Gunda in Halar district (Kathiawad) which is dated in the year 103, that is, 181 A. D. It commemorates the event of building a well for public use in the village of Rasopadra by the general Rudrabhūti the son of the general Bāpaka Ābhira. After his death his nephew Jīvadāman again seems to have come to the throne. We have one of his coins bearing the year 118, that is, 196 A. D.

Then comes Rudrasena - a son of Rudrasimha to the throne. Of his time we have two incriptions - one found at Muliyasar and the other at Jasdan. The inscription from Muliyāsar commemorates a heroic deed of Vanijaka who saved a friend's life at the cost of his own. The Jasdan inscription refers to a 'ṣatra', which may mean a house for charitable feeding, built

---

It may be noted that the gotras of Ṛshabhadeva of the second and the fourth inscriptions are the same viz. Opaṣati - which is also the gotra of Jeshṭavīrā of the first. The father's name in the second is Sīhila, while in the fourth is Treshṭadata. Yaṣadatā-wife of Madana-and Treshṭadata were Buddhists. The stones on which these four inscriptions are engraved are called 'Lashti' in all the four.

These inscriptions were deciphered by Prof. Devadatta Bhandarkara. They were originally at Andhau in Cutch. (Historical inscriptions of Gujarat. Part I. pp. 17-20).

by several brothers whose names cannot be made out. In the geneology the kings are called 'Swāmi' and 'Bhadramukha'.

I mention only those Kshatrapa kings about whom we know something more than mere names which are given by the coins. In the case of Sanghadāman the interesting question arises whether or not he is to be identified with the 'Sandanes whom the Periplus describes as taking the regular mart Kalyāṇ, near Bombay from Saraganes that is the Dakhan Ṣātakarṇis, and, to prevent it again, becoming a place of trade, forbidding all Greek ships to visit Kalyāṇ, and sending under a guard to Broach any Greek ships that even by accident entered its port' (B. G. footnote p. 44.). There are, however, reasons against identifying Sandanes with Sanghadāman.

After examining the available evidence the author of the footnote of the B. G. concludes "The only possible lord of Gujarāt either in the second or third century who can have adopted such a policy was the Kshatrapa of Ujjain in Malwa and Minnagara or Junagadh in Kathiawada, the same ruler, who to encourage foreign vessels to visit Broach had stationed native fishermen with well-manned long boats off the south Kathiawada coast to meet ships and pilot them through the tidal and other dangers up the Narbada to Broach. It follows that the Sandanes of the Periplus and Ptolemy's North Konkan Sādans are the Gujarat Mahākshatrapas" (p. 45).

From the hoard of Kshatrapa coins found in 1861 near Karad on the river Krishna, thirty-one miles south of Satara, it is inferred that from Vijayasena

(A. D. 238 - 249) to Visvasena (A. D. 296 - 300) at least, the Gujarat power had spread in the Deccan. (B. G. pp. 48 - 49).

There is a mutilated Kshatrapa inscription - No. 9 of the Historical Inscriptions of Gujarat - which gives no date but mentions the names of Chashṭana and Jayadāman. The Kshatrapa that may have been intended is probably the great - grand - son of Chashṭana and grand - son of Jayadāman. In that case he would be Dāmājaḍasrī - son of Rudradāman. This inscription mentions Girinagara as the place where something is done. It mentions ' Kevali (Jnā)na sam (?...prāpta) nam...jarāmaraṇa'. From the occurence of the word Kevali, it appears to be a Jaina inscription, because, this word is generally used by Jainas in the sense of one who has attained to omniscience.

So this inscription may be taken to imply the existence of the followers of Jainism in Saurāshṭra in the second century A. D.

The power of the Kshatrapas was destroyed by Chandragupta II of the Gupta dynasty, and Western India including Gujarat and Surāshtra was annexed to the Gupta Empire. Rudrasimha son of Satyasimha was attacked, dethroned and killed. Vincent Smith puts this event in the year 395 A. D.

8

Before we come to the Gupta rule over Gujarat we may take notice of the Traikuṭakas. We have three copper - plate grants of the Traikuṭakas. One from Pardi of the king Dahrasena dated Sam. 207; another from Surat of the king Vyāghrasena dated

Sam. 241; and the third from Kanheri dated Sam. 245 not giving the king's name but only mentioning 'in the year two hundred and forty five of the increasing rule of the Traikuṭakas.'

We have also coins of Dahrasena and his son Vyāghrasena. In Dahrasena's coin on one side is a bust and on the other a Chaitya and stars and the Brāhmī legend "Mahārājendradattaputra - Parama - Vaishṇava - Ṣri Mahārāja Dahrasena." On the silver coin of Vyāghrasena we have the Brahmi legend 'Mahārāja Dahrasenaputra - Parama - Vaishṇava - Ṣri Mahārāja Vyāghrasena.

The Samvat is identified with Chedi or Kalachuri era. The initial date is 248 - 49 A. D. So the three inscriptions will have the corresponding dates, 455 - 56 A. D.; 489–90 A. D.; 493–94 A. D. respectively.

Even though the materials regarding the Traikūṭakas are meagre, it is possible to infer from them that they were powerful kings who ruled southern Gujarat and North Konkana and for sometime Saurāshṭra also, (Purātattva Vol. II p. 58) in the later half of the 5th century A. D. According to the B. G. this 'dynasty rose to consequence about the time of the middle Kshatrapas (250 A. D.).

Dahrasena was the performer of an Aṣvamedha sacrifice. We know from his coin that his father's name was Indradatta. He issued his grant from his military camp at Āmraka to a Brāhmaṇa named Nanna inhabitant of Kapura giving him the village Taḍāka - sārikā the smaller in the Vishaya - district - of Antara - mandalī. The name of the Dūtaka was Buddhagupta.

His son Vyāghrasena who calls himself the lord of wide Aparānta and other country (Atideṣa) issued his grant from Aniruddhapura to a Brāhmaṇa named Nāgaṡarman a 'Purohita - pallikā' in the Āhāra of Iksharaki. The grant was written by the Mahāsāndhivigrahika – the great minister for peace and war – Karkka. The name of the Dūtaka is Halāhala.

We learn from the coins and these grants that Dahrasena and his son Vyāghrasena were devout Vaishṇavas. In the grants they call themselves Bhagwat-pāda – Karma – kara – the servants of God, and in the coins Parama – Vaishṇava the devout Vaishṇava.

We may note that these Traikuṭakas were connected with Haihayas.

9

Chandragupta II came to the throne about the year 375 A. D. The conquest of Mālawa and Gujarāt including Saurāshṭra must have been a matter of long war. " The expedition which conquered Mālawā seems to have passed from Allahabad by Bundelkhand to Bhilsa and thence to Mālawā. " The way by which the second Chandragupta's army must have marched is inferred as follows : " From Ujjain by way of Bagh and Tanda in the province of Ratt he seems to have entered South Gujarāt and to have passed from the Broach coast to Kathiāwada." Chandragupta II struck silver coins in the Kshatrapa style. His coins in Gujarāt are rare while those of his son Kumāragupta are common. On many gold coins of Chandragupta II a young man is standing behind the main figure with his right hand on the shoulder of the main figure. These figures are supposed to refer to Kumāragupta

and Chandragupta II. From these facts it is inferred that on conquering Gujarāt and Saurāshṭra, Kumāragupta was appointed the viceroy over these provinces. Kumāragupta ascended the throne after his father in the year 413 A. D. He was succeded by Skandagupta in 455 A. D. The first year of his reign was full of trouble for the new emperor. He had to fight the Huns. But within a year or so he seems to have subdued his enemies. He probably added Cutch to his dominions as his coins are common there.

Again we find the lake Sudarṣana providing history, if not making it. The third inscription that the Girnar rock, already referred to, bears is that of Skandagupta of the Gupta Samvat 135, that is, 457 - 58 A. D. It commemorates, in 39 beautiful stanzas, the event of re-building the dam which was again broken by the stormy floods,

In the first stanza, the glory of Vishṇu is sung. Then the Rājarājādhirāja's glory is sung. That is either Skandagupta himself or one of his predecessors. In the third, Skandagupta is mentioned by name and is described as having made the earth 'repose on him' through his own power. In the fourth, mention is made of his having humbled his enemies in Mleccha countries. Upto the tenth verse his kingly qualities are described. In the eleventh verse, the king is described as anxiously thinking as to who amongst his officers is competent enough to bear the burden of governing the Surāshṭras. He finds that Parṇadatta is the man for the job, and appoints him to the post. The king felt at ease after putting Parṇadatta in the West as gods feel at ease by appointing Varuṇa in

the West. (13).× Then in six verses, Chakrapalita the son of Parṇadatta is described. The twenty-sixth tells us that his father seeing his qualities gave him the task of protecting the city. Five more verses describe his work as an efficient officer.

Verses 26 and 27 describe the rains pouring down day and night on the sixth of the month Jyeshṭha in the Gupta year 136, that is, 456 A. D. In verses 28 and 29 the rivers Palāsani and others having their source in the mountain Raivataka (Girnar) are described as going to their lord – the sea. The movement of the waters from the mountain to the sea is described as the riverine hand (nadīmayo hastah) of the friendly mountain Urjayat beautified by the flowers growing on its banks, extended towards the ocean which was in great turmoil on account of the monsoon.* Verse 30, describes the terror of the people not knowing what to do and their day and night counsels.

Then comes the description of the rebuilding of the lake. The whole work was finished in the year 137 of the Gupta Samvat in two months' time. The length of the new dam was one hundred hands, the breadth sixty eight, and the height seven purushas. The last verse expresses the hope that the city enjoyed by its citizens may prosper, and that its sins be destroyed by Brahma sung by hundreds of Brāhmaṇas and be free from famine and other troubles for a hundred years.

This part of the inscription is called Sudarṣana –

* This might also mean that like Varuṇa Parṇadatta was a maritime lord.

* A slightly different interpretation is put upon this verse by others.

taṭāka - saṃskāra - grantha - rachanā -' composition on the repairing of the lake Sudarṣana.'

The second part of the inscription mentions the building of a temple of Vishṇu near the lake by Chakrapālita in the Gupta samvat 138. " The temple as if rising from the mountain Ūrjayat appears as if lording over the head of the city." × The temple is so high that it seems " to obstruct the passage of birds in the sky." *

Skandagupta died about the year 430 A. D. After him the Gupta power appears to have declined from Western India. In Ujjayinī Toramāṇa rules, while Gujarāt becomes independent under the rulers of Valabhi.

Under the Mauryas and the Guptas the imperial city was Pāṭaliputra, and under the Kshatrapas it was Ujjayinī. Leaving out of consideration Ānandapura and Dwārakā - capitals of Gujarāt in Purāṇic times, we may say that historically, the first capital of Gujarat was Girinagara and it remained so far more than seven centuries from the time of Chandragupta Maurya (321 - 297 B. C.) to the time of Skandagupta (480 A. D.).

10

For the history of Valabhi and its rulers our main sources of information are the copper - plate grants issued by the rulers of Valabhi, a few coins,‡ the contemporary accounts of the city and the province given by Yuavan Chang, and references in literary

× ....उत्थितमिवोर्जयतोऽचलस्य ।
कुर्वत् प्रभुत्वमिव भाति पुरस्य मूर्ध्नि ॥

* See note 1 on the remains of the dam in the B. G. p. 70.

‡ Puratattava Vol. II p. 58.

works such as the famous Bhaṭṭikāvya, Daśakumāra-charita, the Kathāsaritsāgara, and the Udayasundarī-kathā of Soḍḍhala, and the traditions of bards.

The traditional accounts of the bards given by Major Watson in the Indian Antiquary Vol. III narrate incidents which are not contradicted by other things known from more reliable sources. In fact they seem to fit in well with them. Relying upon them we can gather the following facts. Bhaṭārka's + forefathers were rulers of Ayodhyā who were subsequently conquered by the Guptas. Bhaṭārka was a general of Skandagupta. Now we know from the Girnar rock inscription that Parnadatta was the governor of Aparānta and his son Chakrapālita was the executive head of Girinagara. According to the bardic accounts Kumārapālagupta - a prince - was sent by his father to conquer Gujarāt, who after fulfilling his mission appointed Chakrapāṇi son of Prandat as the governor of the province. Now this Chakrapāṇi and Prandata may be identified with Chakrapālita and Parṇadatta respectively of the Girnar inscription; though this will create a little discrepancy. According to the inscription Parṇadatta was appointed by Skandagupta and Chakrapālita by his father. This, however, may easily be explained away by supposing that Skandagupta may have confirmed Parṇadatta and his son - appointed by his father Kumāragupta. * In any case Bhaṭārka seems to have displaced Chakrapālita or Chakrapāṇi accord-

+ It is also spelt as Bhaṭakka and Bhaṭṭārkka in the copper-plate grants.

* It appears that the bards have confused Skandagupta and Kumāragupta I and II.

ing to the bards, and become an independent ruler at Valabhi after Skandagupta.

To what race did Bhaṭārka belong? According to the B. G. "Bhaṭārka belonged to some low or stranger tribe. Though the evidence falls short of proof the probability seems strong that Bhaṭārka belonged to the Gurjara tribe, and that it was the supremacy of him and his descendants which gave rise to the name Gurjjara - ıātra — the country of the Gurjjars, a name first used by outsiders and afterwards adopted by the people of Gujarāt" (p. 85). Inferring from the copper - plates known to them, the authors of the B. G. had come to the conclusion that Bhaṭārka had crushed the power of the Maitrakas and had become consequently a sovereign ruler. But Fleet did not accept this view. The wording of the copper - plates is such as to give rise to a different interpretation. According to Fleet "Maitrakāṇām" means that Bhaṭārka belonged to the Maitrakas. But Kielhorn did not accept this interpretation as there is no such word as Vaṃśe or Kule. The later discovery of other copper - plates at Ganesgada, however, supported the view of Fleet. Hultzsch who discussed the whole question again in the Epigraphica Indica Vol. III says on the strength of the new discovery. "Whether we paraphrase the passage by 'Maitrakāṇām Bhaṭārko'bhavat' or supply the word 'Vaṃse' after 'Maitrakāṇām', it is now evident that Bhaṭārka, the ancestor of Valabhi kings, himself belonged to the family or tribe of the Maitrakas."

These Maitrakas are identified with the Meḍhas or Mehrs of Kathiawad in the B. G. Mr. Jayaswal,

however, on the strength of certain references in the Ārya Manjuśrī Kalpa and the Paikuli Sassanian inscription in Asuristan regards the Maitrakas as a branch of Yādavas (pp. 25 - 26) *

The Historical Inscriptions of Gujarāt Part I edited by Mr. Acharya, publishes one hundred and one copper - plates of which five are undated and do not contain the names of the donors. The first plate is that of Droṇasimha and is dated Valabhi samvat 183 Śrāvaṇa 15th of the bright half which agrees with 502 A. D. Saturday 6th of July. The last plate that we have is that of Śilāditya the Seventh and is V. S. 447 Jyeshṭha 5th of the bright half which will correspond with 766 - 67 A. D. May or June. Thus we have records for two hundred and sixty five years. The plate issued by Droṇasimha does not mention the names of his elder brother Dharasena or his father Sri Bhaṭārka, unless we understand Paramabhaṭṭāraka - pādānudhyāto in Droṇasimha's plate as referring to Bhaṭakka or Bhaṭārka. The first mention of the names of the founder and his eldest son is in the plate of Dhruvasena I dated Valabhi samvat 206 Bhādrapada that is, 525 - 26 A. D. If we suppose that Bhaṭārka became independent after the death of Skandagupta whose general, presumably, he was,‡ we may say that

* Mr. C. V. Vaidya, however. is of the opinion that Maitraka was the name of the family like Maukhari, Chālukya etc., and that it must be left untranslated, and no conjectures should be hazarded about its meaning. But if any are to be made, why not say that Maitraka means Maitra - born of the sun. p. 243 History of Medieval Hindu India Vol. I.

‡ It is not certain whether Toramāṇa's sway extended over Gujarāt or not. If it did, we will have to come down to 490 A. D. for Bhaṭārka's independence.

he and his son Senāpati Dharasena I ruled over Gujarāt for about twenty to twenty-two years, that is, 480-500-502 A.D. Thus we have in all twenty-one rulers reigning in the city of Valabhi over a period of about two hundred and eighty seven years. Of these twentyone, the copper-plates issued by fifteen kings have been discovered up till now

From the titles prefixed to the names of kings, as also from the mention of places and districts we are able to form some idea about the political position of different kings with reference to other rulers, imperial or otherwise of India, as also of their dominions. The titles, however, should not be taken too literally. Senāpati, Mahāsāmanta, or Mahāpratihāra do not necessarily suggest dependence as some of these were repeated as a matter of routine. So also the title of Chakravartin when it occurs for the first time may be taken to indicate All-India power but not a thorough-going subjugation of the whole country. Bearing these considerations in mind let us try to form some idea of the political power of Valabhi kings.

The founder Śri Bhaṭārka who must have been an able man and whose great valour is described in the plates is only called a Senāpati – probably because he did not assume other titles. So also his eldest son Dharasena. But his second son Droṇasimha calls himself 'Parama-Bhaṭṭāraka-pādānudhyāto' as also 'Mahārāja'. This means that though he was a 'great king' he was looked after by the great Bhaṭṭāraka, that is, lord. It is not certain who this 'great lord' was; whether he was an emperor or some great head of a religious sect; for the word Bhaṭṭāraka conveys

both the meanings. In the plates of his younger brother Dhruvasena I the third son of Śrī Bhaṭārka we find it mentioned that he was crowned king personally by 'Paramaswāmī' – 'over – lord' the king of the whole world. This probably means that his sovereignty was recognised by the then occupant of the imperial throne, who may have personally come to grace the occasion. According to Cunningham "It was the last act of supreme sovereignty performed by Buddhagupta."

It may be that the general Bhaṭārka and his son the general Dharasena were military rulers who were more or less occupied with fighting; for it is only about Mahārāja Droṇasimha that the plates of Dhruvasena say that he acted according to the duties prescribed for kings by Manu and other law-givers and was consequently a 'Dharmarāja' who had made provision for education (Vinaya) and systematic government (Vyavasthā-paddhati) of his people. This description reminds us of Kālidāsa who, if he lived in the Gupta period, must have been fresh to the memory of the literary men of Droṇasimha. The poet in his Raghuvaṃśa describes Dilīpa as the real father of his subjects because he educated, protected, and supported his people who were said to swerve not an inch from the path laid down by Manu.

Mahārāja Droṇāsimha seems to have set the fashion for his successors of giving great donations – though only one copper plate of his is as yet discovered. He made his donation for the benefit of a temple of the goddess Pāṇdurājā.

Of Dhruvasena I we have in all about sixteen plates. In some he calls himself 'Parama – bhaṭṭāraka.

pādānudhyāta ' that is, 'one looked after by the great over-lord', Mahāsāmanta-'the great chief' and Mahārāja 'the great king.' In addition to these titles, in the plate dated 216 (= 535 A. D.) found at Vaḷā-the modern namesake of Valabhi, he gives himself the titles-'Mahāpratihāra' 'the great door-keeper,' Mahādaṇḍa-nāyaka, 'the great general or governor,' Mahakartakṛtika which may be literally translated as the great follower of Kārtikeya-'the general of gods,' and Mahārāja 'the great king.' In some later plates he gives himself merely the first and the last titles.

In common with his predecessors his military exploits are referred to in his plates. His two special qualifications may be noted. One is, Avaboddha Sāstrārtha-tattvānām-knower of the essence of the Ṣāstras, that is, authoritative works on the different branches of learning. Another, refers to his great liberality to friends and learned men, and religious institutions.

We find from his plates that his father Bhaṭārka and his elder brothers Dharasena and Droṇasimha were Parama-Māheṣvara-that is, great devotees of Ṣiva and that he himself was Parama-Bhāgavata, that is, a great devotee of Vishṇu. His grants, however, show him to be a man of liberal religious outlook. His copper-plate dated V. 216 (that is, 535 A. D.) is given for the benefit of a Buddhist Vihāra built by his niece (sister's daughter) Duddā who is called Paramopāsikā and that of V. 217 (that is, 536 A. D.) for this as well as another Vihāra built by Buddhadāsa. The expenses of providing Buddhist monks with the necessaries of life, of treating Buddhist pilgrims from all

directions as guests, of worshipping Buddhist idols, and of repairing Vihāras, were met from the income of these grants. The other grants are to Brāhmaṇas learned in different Vedas. It may be noted that three grants one of 210 (=529 A. D.), the other of 221 (=540 A. D.), and the third of 226 (=545 A. D) — are given to the Brāhmaṇas of Vadanagara the famous seat of Brahmanical learning. In the first it is simply called Nagara; in the second Ānandapura, and in the third Ānartta-pura. In the third the names of the donees cannot be made out; in the first, the donees are two brothers: Ṣantīṣarmā and Devaṣarmā of Ātreyagotra, students of the Vājasaneyi version of Yajurveda. In the second the names of the donees are Skanda-trāta and Guha-trāta of Bhāradwāja gotra, students of Sāmaveda (Chhandogasabrhmachāri). This shows that the limits of his kingdom in the north must have included Vadanagara also.

Dhruvasena I must have reigned, at the least, for more than twenty years; probably for thirty years, from 519 to 549 A. D. After him his brother Dharapaṭṭa seems to have occupied the throne. His records, if any, are not yet discovered. It is rather strange that he is not mentioned in the grants of his son, though he is mentioned in those of his grand son. From them we learn that he was Paramāditya bhakta — the great devotee of the Sun.

The first plate of Guhasena the son of Dharapaṭṭa is dated V. 240 (=559 A. D.). In all we have five records of his reign, three of which are copper - plates. The second one is dated 246 (= 565 A. D.) and the third one

is dated V. 248 (=567 A. D.). Upon a broken clay - pot we have a very small inscription giving the date 247 (566 A. D.) and the name Śrī Guhasena and the word 'ghaṭa.' It means that here is something referring to the pot. The fifth record is a stone inscription from which we can make out only the name of Guhasena and nothing more

Guhasena is simply called Mahārāja in his plates but his other special qualifications mentioned in this as well as in his successors' plates may be noted. It seems the the Royal Treasury had been replenished in his times for he is compared to an ocean for possessing wealth. Another description of his which says that from the time of childhood his second was his sword is rather significant. Like Droṇāsimha he seems to have paid much attention to the regulation of Smṛtis in the act of governing his people. In his case it is mentioned that the word 'Rājan' was literally true for he pleased the heart of his people. * This again reminds us of the Raghuvamśa of Kalidasa where the poet says the same thing about Raghu.

All the three plates describe grants given to the Buddhist monasteries. The first is given to the Vihāra in the city of Valabhi built by Duddā who is called Pujyā - that is 'respected.' This is natural for she was an aunt - that is, father's sister - of Guhasena. In addition to the usual purposes of providing for the monks and pilgrims, repairing the monasteries etc. one more purpose is mentioned - viz. buying of 'books of good religion' that is, Budhism for the Vihara.

* His handsomeness, form, steadiness of mind, depth of intelligence, and wealth are referred to.

This proves the existence of a library at least of Buddhist books. The eighteen Nikāyas are also mentioned. The second plate describes the grant given for the same purpose. Duddā is referred to more respectfully as Duddāpāda and the Vihāra is called after her Duddā - vihāra. At the end we find 'Svamukhājnā - that is, 'oral order'. This probably implies that no Dūtaka was necessary. It was written by Skandagupta - appointed to the post of the minister for war and peace. The third is given to the Abhyantarikāvihāra–built by Mimmā who is respectfully referred to as Mimmāpāda, near the Bhaṭṭārkāvihāra which was given to Rājasthānīya (- that is the official guardian -) Sūra. Here also the oral order is mentioned, the grant being written by the same Skandabhatta. In the first two grants Guhasena is a Paramamāhesvara, that is, a great devotee of Ṣiva; in this, however, he is a Paramopāsaka, that is, a great devotee of Buddha. This means that he became a Buddhist between the years 565 to 567 A. D. This may have been due to the influence of the aunt Duddā. Guhasena ruled probably from 554 A. D. to 569 A. D.

He was succeded by his son Dharasena II. We have some ten or eleven plates bearing his name, the earliest being V. 252 (571 A. D.) and the latest being V. 270 (589 A. D.). As mentioned before, his plates give the name of his grandfather Dharapaṭṭa left out by his father's plates. Most of these grants are given to Brāhmaṇas of various families learned in the Vedas. One plate of the year 252 (571 A. D.) is given to one Rudragopa - a son of Rudraghosha of Kauṣravas gotra and a student of Atharvaveda. He lived in Ānarttapura - that is, modern Vadanagara.

The grant of the year 259 (578 A. D.) was given to a vihāra named Bappapādiya built at the suggestion of Āchārya Bhadanta Sthiramati. One grant of the year 270 (589 A. D.) was given to the already famous Duddā-vihāra. A third grant, whose date cannot be made out, is also given to a vihāra in Valabhi. Another of the same year was given to one Vishṇumitra who originally belonged to Ānarttapura and was then living in Kheṭaka, that is modern Kheḍā. The village Āsilāpallikā in the Baṇdarijidri tālukā may probably be Āṣāpalli – the older site of Karṇāvatī and modern Ahmedabad which is so near to Bārejaḍi.

Of his special attributes we may note the following: He had astonished all the archers by his natural strength as well as his training in archery. He maintained all the gifts of the previous kings. He showed in himself that Ṣri (= Wealth) and Sarasvatī (= Learning) could live together which again reminds us of Kālidāsa's Bharatavākya in the Vikramorvaṣīya.

He ruled for more than 18 years.

He was succeeded by his son Ṣri Ṣilāditya who was known by the title Dharmāditya because he took particular care in following the model of the ideal kings of old. Even though he was immensely learned he could find pleasure even in a little good - saying wherever he found.

Ten of his plates have been discovered–the earliest dated in the year 286 (605 A. D.); the latest in the year 290 (609 A. D.). One grant of the year 286, and another whose date cannot be made out are given to a Vihāra in Vamṣakaṭa which was built by the king himself. The grant of the year 287 and one grant of the year 290

are given to the Bhikkhuṇīs of Yakshasura. Another grant of the year 290, it may be noted, was given to a temple of Mahādeva – a rare instance, looking to the fact that almost all the kings of Valabhi were Paramamāheṣvaras. This one may indicate that there might have been many more such grants which are either lost or are not yet discovered. If we do not have some such supposition it would be very difficult to explain this paucity of grants from these great devotees of Ṣiva. A third grant of the year 290 gives to the Brāhmaṇas Mitraṣarman and Gameṣvara sons of Rudraṣarman the village of Daṣapura to which place they originally belonged (Mandosara in Mālwa), but were then living in Valabhi. This shows that his kingdom included part of Mālwa at least.

As Molap'o of Yuan Chang comprises main land Gujarat‡ we may quote from his travels, as it gives

‡ "Although it is impossible to reconcile all the data given in the pilgrim's text, and several details are open to controversy, it is clear that the kingdom or country of Mo–la–P'o essentially comprised the basin of the Mahī river, with the region to the east of Sābaramati and a portion of the hilly tract of Southern Rajputānā perhaps extended as far east as Rutlam. Mo-la–P'o was bounded on the North by the Gurjar kingdom of Bhilmal, on the north–west by the subordinate principality or province of Ānandapura (Varnagar), lying to the west of Sabarmati, and on the east by the kingdom (Avanti) or eastern Malwa of which Ujjain was capital. Besides Ānandapura two other countries, Ki–t'A or Ki–ch'A and Su–la–ch'A or Sulatha were dependencies of Mo–la–P'o. The latter dependency certainly is to be identified with Soratha (Surastra), or Southern Kathiawar. The identity of the former is disputed some good authorities holding the Chinese name to mean the Kaira (Kheda, Khetak) District, while others believe it to mean Kuchchh (Cutch)." (E. H. I. pp. 323–324.)

some idea of the civilization of the people at the time and summarizes the records of the country about Ṣilāditya.

"This country Mo-la-Po is about 6000 li in circuit. The capital * is some 30 li round. It is defended (or supported) by Mahī river of the south and east. The soil is rich and fertile and produces abundant harvests. Shrubs and trees are numerous and flourishing. Flowers and fruits are met with in great quantities. The soil is suitable in an especial manner for winter wheat. They mostly eat biscuits and (or, made of) parched corn flower. The disposition of the men is virtuous and docile, and they are in general of remarkable intelligence. The language is elegant and clear, and their learning is wide and profound.

"Two countries in India on the borders, are remarkable for the great learning of the people viz., Mo-la-Po on the South-west and Magadha on the North-east. In this they esteem virtue and respect politeness (humanity). They are of an intelligent mind and exceedingly studious; nevertheless the men of this country are given to heretical beliefs as well as the true faiths and so live together. There are about one hundred Sanghārāmas in which some 2000 priests dwell. They study the Little Vehicle, and belong to the Sammatiya school. There are one hundred Deva-

* "The unnamed capital, which was situated to the south-east of a great river, or according to another reading, of the Mahī has not been identified. If the great river means the Sabarmati, the capital may have stood at or near the site of Ahmedabad" (E. H. I. p. 323). It might, as well, have been Mahīnagara or Skambhatīrtha or Cambay.

Temples of different kinds. The heretics are very numerous but principally the Pāśupatas (the cinder-covering heretics).

" The records of the country state : Sixty years before this flourished Śilāditya a man of eminent wisdom and great learning; his skill in literature was profound. He cherished and protected the four kinds of creatures, and deeply respected the three pleasures. From the time of his birth to his last hour, his face never crimsoned with anger, nor did his hands ever injured a living thing. His elephants and horses drank water that has been strained, after which he gave it them, lest any creature living in the water should be injured. Such were his love and humanity. During the fifty years and more of his reign, the wild beasts became familiar with men, and the people did not injure or slay them. By the side of his palaces he built a Vihāra. He exhausted the skill of the artist, and used every kind of ornaments in decorating it. In it he put images of several Buddhas, Lords of the World. Every year he convoked an assembly called Moksha Mahā Parishad, and summoned the priests of the four quarters. He offered them " the four things " in religious charities; he also gave them sets of three garments used in the religious services and also bestowed on them the seven precious jewels in wonderful varieties. This meritorious custom has continued in practice without interruption till now." (pp. 260 - 62. Book II. Buddhist Records of the Western World--Beal.)

It is this Śilāditya, who according to Dr. Jayaswal, is referred to in the Āryamanjuśrī Kalpa. *

* " This Śila the Dharmrāja, of the family of Dhara is Śilāditya Dharmāditya I, the seventh in succession from

His grants and those of his successor mention Guhasena after Bhaṭārka omitting the intervening kings.

Ṣilāditya was succeeded by his younger brother Kharagraha none of whose grants, if any, are as yet discovered. We, however, learn from his son's copper-plates that he was a learned man as also a patron of learning. From the same source we come to know that he worked in the capacity of Yuvarāja to his elder brother, a fact which is corroborated by the mention of Kharagraha - as a Dūtaka in some grants of Ṣilāditya.

Dharasena I founder of the Maitraka dynasty of Valabhi. His inscriptions which date equivalent to 605 A. D. to 609 A. D. have been found. His successor Chapala will correspond with Kharagrha (his nephew) of the inscriptions. His nephew Dhruva-sena II was the next king. Records of his, dated 629-639 A. D. have been found. Dhruva is described in the AMMK as anuja of Chapala, which is to be taken in its original sense 'born after,' 'a younger cadet' and not 'younger brother.' Yuan-Chang saw the artistic Buddhist temple built by Ṣilāditya when he visited Valabhi in the reign of Dhruva, who was a vassal and son-in-law to Harsha.

The dynastic description and the extent of the territories of Ṣilāditya given here settled the controversy started by Hoernle. (J. R. A. S, 1909, 122.) He was the king of the territory from Ujjain in Eastern Malwa upto the west country of the sea, that is, Kachchha, which was the limit of the west country according to the Puranic Geography (I. A. 1933, 126); and he was king of the Lāḍas, that is, what we call Gujarat, and of Valabhi that is, southern Kathiawar.

Dhruva, according to our text, becomes subordinate, which was a fact in Harshavardhan's time." (Imperial Hist. of India pp. 24-25)

He was succeeded by his younger brother Dhruvasena II. We have about seven grants of this king. The earliest is dated 310 (=629 A D.), the latest 321 (=640 A. D). We learn from these grants that his other name was Bālāditya. They also attribute to him proficiency in arts generally and mastery in the Grammer of Pāṇini, who is mentioned by the name of Ṣālāturīya, and in the science of Polity. He is compared to Manu the first king, because like him he was elected king by his subjects for his merits. His steadfast friendship did not deter him from giving up those friends who were found to have faults of character. This reminds us of Rāghuvamṣa canto I verse 28, where Kālidāsa says of Dilīpa that he cut off connection with even a dear person if he were wicked, like a snake-bitten finger.

The grant of the year 310 (=629 A. D.) is given to the vihāra which was built by Gūhaka and was a part of the great vīhāra built by the princess Duddā in Valabhi. So also the grant of the year 319 (=638 A. D.) was given for providing for the Bhikkhuṇīs residing in the vīhāra built by one Puṇṇabhata near the Yakshasura vihāra. In the year 320 (=639 A. D.) he renewed the grant given to the temple of Kottam-mahikādevī by Mahārāja Droṇasimha which appears to have become null interim. This might either refer to the grant of Droṇasimha given in the year 183 (=302 A. D.) where, however, the name of the goddess is Pāndurājā or it might refer to some other gift unknown to us.

The grants of the years 320 and 321 (=639-40

A. D.) give villages in Mālwa to certain Brāhmaṇas. This shows the extent of his territory.

From a copper-plate grant of Dadda II, who was a contemporary, we learn that Dhruvasena II who was defeated by the great Harsha of Kanouj, was helped by him. Later on, however, Ṣri Harsha gave Dhruvasena II his daughter in marriage and made peace with him, probably because he was a blue-blooded Kshatariya This is an instance similar to that of Pradyota-king of Ujjayinī giving his daughter Vāsvadattā to Udayana Vatsarāja. This event is also referred to by Yuan-Chang who refers to Dhruvasena as Tu-lu P'o-Po-ta, that is, Dhruva Bhatta.

He was succeeded by his son Dharasena IV. We have about four grants of his discovered up till now. The earliest being dated 326 (=645 A. D.) the latest 330 (=649 A. D.). He was the most powerful of the monarchs of Valabhi. He is called Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājadhirāja Paramesvara Chakravarti Ṣrī Ajjaka-pādānudhyāta Ṣrī Dharasena.

The mention of the title Chakravartin in the case of Dharasena IV requires some explanation and confirmation. It is rather difficult to imagine that this is merely an ornamental applelation. It must have some basis in fact. Now we know that he was the son of the daughter of Harshavardhana who was then the emperor of India. As Harshavardhana died without a direct male heir, his throne might have been occupied by his daughter's son Dharasena IV. This would entitle Dharasena to call himself a Chakravartin. This supposition receives confirmation from Ṣrī Ārya Manjuṣrīkalpa.

This book was written about the year 770 or roughly 800 A. D.*

Now we know from Yuan - Chang that he referred to the then king of Valabhi as a kshatriya and we also know that his name was Dhruvapaṭṭa or Dhruvabhaṭṭa. As Harshavardhana was a vaishya there is some point in calling his successor a kshatriya. Again we find from the copper - plates of Dharasena IV that he had given many donations in support of Buddhist vihāras for the maintenance of the monks and for the worship of Buddhist idols. All this evidence supports the identification of the king whose name began with 'Dha' with Dharasena IV - made out by Dr. Jayswal.

"Rājyavardhana had his successor in Harsha; and Dh., that is, Dharasena IV his grandson was really Harsha's anuja or descendant in which sense the MMK always uses the term. According to the Mitāksharā idea of Hindu Law, Dharasena IV would be considered a successor and descendant of Rājyavardhana. It is difficult to give value to the initial V. or J, (Tibetian version) of the successor of Dh. but the description

* Jayaswal's Imperial History of India. Introductory p. 3. According to the MMK Rājyavardhana was succeeded by a Kshatriya, the first letter of whose name began with 'Dha'. He ruled for three years. He was succeeded by a king the first letter of whose name began with a letter 'Dha'. He is called Sārvabhumika Bhūpati which technically means an emperor. He had an army consisting of elephants, horses and chariots, as well as a navy. He conquered all the enemies that faced him in battle. He decorated the earth by building many vihāras and idols of Buddha.

leaves little doubt that it was Dhruvasena III, 'the youngest' of his grand-uncles, all elder to Dharasena's grandfather. The long age (100 years) confirms the identification.

"It is noteworthy that the Valabhi kings maintained a navy.

"Dharasena IV in the year 546 A. D. issued two copper-plates; in the earlier of the two in the same Kartikadi year (326 GE) he is not Chakravartin (Emperor), while a few months after he assumed that title (Bhandarkar's List, No. 1348, No. 1349). We should therefore conclude that his grandfather Harshavardhana died between the month of Māgha (5th Dark Fortnight) and Asadha (S., 10). By that title he claimed to be the heir to the Empire of Harshavardhana and something more, that is, as the Emperor of South." (Imp. Hist. of India. p. 67)

This sudden development of the kingdom of Valabhi into an empire through inheritance explains the geographical description of the territories as well as the big titles of the successors of Dharasena IV; though we may note that the title of Chakravartin is dropped by his successors some of whom still call themselves Parameṣvara†.

† We cannot say with certainty who was the king whose name began with Va or Ja, who succeeded the king the initial letter of whose name was Dha. He may be Derabhatta or his son Dhruvasena III or Ṣilāditya II; or it is just possible that Dharasena might have had a son whose name began with Va or Ja and the kingdom of Valabhi might have passed to Derabhatta the son of his grandfather's brother. This is merely a surmise.

His grant of the year 326 (=645 A. D.) is donated to meet the expenses of the upkeep of a vihāra as also of repairing a reservoir in the vicinity to provide facility of water, both of them, originally, gifts of the minister Skandabhaṭa. It may be noted that the Bhikkhus who resided in this vihāra were of the Mahāyāna sect of Buddhism.

The three other grants are given to various Brāhmaṇas learned in Vedas. The first grant of the year 330 (=649 A. D.) is given to a Brāhmaṇa hailing from Anarttapura. This one and the other of the year 330 (=649 A. D.) are issued, it may be noted, from the royal military camp at Bharukachchha, that is, the modern Broach. The Dūtaka in the two grants of 326 is Kumāra Dhruvasena, while in those of 330 is Rājaduhitā (that is Princess) Bhupā or Bhuvā.

Two attributes of the emperor may be noted: his pearl ear-ring is said to indicate the pure learning that he had received through his ear; the other, he is called a Dhanurveda in Kārmuka, that is the very embodiment of the science of archery.

It was in the reign of this emperor that Bhaṭṭi the author of the Rāvaṇavadha more usually known as Bhaṭṭikāvya, lived.

After Dharasena IV the line of succession turned back to the son of Ṣilāditya II, whose name was Derabhatta. No records of his reign are found. From references about him in his son's copper-plates we gather that he was the lord of the earth whose two breasts were the mountains Sahya and Vindhya. He was succeeded by his son Dhruvasena III. Two of his grants are found. One of them is dated in the year 334 (=653 A. D.). The other plate being broken its

date cannot be made out. The first one is given to Bhaṭṭibhaṭa who was a son of Bappa and a resident of Mahichchhaka. One is tempted to guess that this Bhaṭṭi might be the same as the author of Bhaṭṭikāvya. The other grant is donated to the Duddāvihāra.

The learning of Dhruvasena III is described figuratively by saying that as his ear is already ornamented with learning the jewelled ear-ring was a sort of repetition of ornament. He was succeeded by Kharagraha II who is called Dharmāditya. * One grant of his dated 337 (=656 A. D.) is found. Strangely enough we do not find his other name Dharmāditya in this grant of his. The donee is one Nārāyaṇa hailing from Ānandapura and residing in Kheṭaka.

After Kharagraha II we have six kings all of whom bear the name of Ṣilāditya. No grant of Ṣilāditya II is discovered, but in those of Ṣilāditya III he is called the lord of the earth whose breast is the mountain Vindhya.

Ṣilāditya III is called Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Parameṣvara Ṣrī Bāvapādānudhyāta Paramabhaṭṭārka Mahārājādhirāja Parameṣvara Ṣrī Ṣilāditya in his copper-plates. About eleven of his

* It is rather strange that he is referred to as 'agraja' which usually means an elder brother. Ṣilāditya II who succeeded Kharagraha II is also very strangely called Ṣilāditya's 'agrajanmā'. I think there is some clerical error in 'Agraja' which should be 'Angaja' and 'Agrajanmā' which should be 'Angajanmā'. We may not that just before this, in the plates, Ṣrī Dhruvasena is called 'angaja'=son-of Derabhatta. If this explanation of the discrepancy is accepted, Kharagraha II would be the son of Dhruvasena III and Ṣilāditya II would become the son of Kharagraha II.

copper – plates have been found, the earliest being dated in the year 342 (=661 A. D.) and the latest in the year 365 (= 684 A. D.). The plates dated 343, 356 give grants to vihāras built by Vimalagupta and Sthiramati situated within the precincts of Duddāvihāra, and the one, having no date, gives a grant to Duddā-vihāra. The donee of the plate of the year 352 (=671 A. D.) is a Brāhmaṇa named Gopadatta a son of adhvaryu Kikkaka hailing from Ānandapura and residing at the time in Valabhi.

Of Ṣilāditya IV there are about five copper – plates; the earliest being dated 375 (= 694 A. D.) the latest 387 (= 706 A. D.); of Ṣilāditya V two, both dated in the year 403 (= 722 A. D.); of Ṣilāditya VI one, dated 441 (= 760 A. D.); and of Ṣilāditya VII one, dated 447 (= 766 A. D.). All the Ṣilādityas from II to VII bear almost the same titles. If these titles are to be regarded as indicative of some real state of affairs, we can say that after the emperor Dharasena IV the dominions of the monarchs of Valabhi must have been very extensive including the whole of modern Gujrat plus at least western Mālva.

So many as six kings coming in succession bearing one name of Ṣilāditya explains why in later tradition Valabhi was associated with the name of Ṣilāditya. This, however, is a stumbling block to the student of history; for very often when this name occurs in literature, it is not possible to understand which of the seven Ṣilādityas is intended. Thus we find in the Ṣatrunjayamahātmya that one Ṣilāditya was a Jain whose teacher was Dhaneṣvara. We cannot say which of the seven is intended.

We also find a Ṣilāditya mentioned by Soḍḍhala the author of the Udayasundarīkathā (composed between 1026-1050 A. D.). While describing the genesis of his caste of the Vālabha Kāyastha (that is Kāyasthas of Valabhi) he refers to one Kalāditya as the founder of his caste. This Kalāditya is mentioned as a brother of Ṣilāditya and as his principal minister. Here again the question arises which of the seven Ṣilādityas is meant. Soddhala himself, in a way, answers the question. When describing the victorious march of Ṣilāditya he mentions one Dharmapāla - the ruler of Uttarāpatha whom S. finds difficult to subdue. The only powerful king of Uttarāpatha of the name of Dharmapāla that we know of is the second king of the Pāla dynasty. According to the Tibetian historian Tārānātha, as quoted by Smith, 'his rule extended from the Bay of Bengal to Delhi and Jalandhara in the North and to the valleys of the Vindhyan range in the south' (E. H. I. p. 398). A ruler of such a dominion would, of course, be called an 'Uttarāpatha - svāmin'. He is said to belong to the dynasty of Māndhātṛ. Smith puts Dharmapāla who is credited with a reign of sixty - four years about 800 A. D. (E. H. I. p. 398). Prior to the thirty-second year of his reign, as recorded in two of his grants, he had defeated Indrapāla or Indrāyudha and installed in his place Chakrāyudha. This event took place soon after 800 A. D. So we can see that Dharmapāla must be ruling prior to 800 A. D. say about 790 A. D. Relying on the evidence of the MMK Dr. Jayaswal places his predecessor Gopāla's reign in the year C. 730 A. D. to 757. Now we saw that the latest Valabhi copper - plate that we

know of is that of Śilāditya VII of the year 766 A. D. That makes him a contemporary of Dharmapāla, with whom, according to Soḍḍhala he waged a successful war. This early reverse in arms that Dharmapāla must have suffered at the hands of Śilāditya VII might explain why there is no king soon after Gopālaka. However this may be, we can say almost with certainty that Śilāditya VII and Dharmapāla were contemporaries and that it is Śilāditya VII that is referred to by Soḍḍhala.

From this survey of the kings of Maitraka dynasty from Śrī Bhaṭārka to Silāditya VII we find Valabhi assuming prominence in the history of India. It must not, however, be supposed that the city of Valabhi was found by the Maitrakas or that it had no prominence before that. We have evidence to infer the existence of Valabhi in the second century A. D. In the collection of articles found near Valabhi made by Mr. Vajeshankar Gaurishankar there are clay seals of the second and the fifth century A. D. which prove the existence of the place at that time. Ptolemy of the second century A. D. seems to refer to Valabhi under the name of Balai. Valabhi was not so much inland in ancient times as it is now. According to the author of the B. G. "its choice as capital was probably due to its being a harbour on the Bhavanagara creek. Since the days of Valabhi's prime the silt which thickly covers the ruins had also filled and choked the channel which once united it with the Bhavnagara creek when Ghelā was probably a fair-sized river" (p. 79.).

We find reference to Valabhi in the story literature which generally give imaginary place-names but make

an exception in case of great capitals like Pāṭaliputra, Ujjayinī or Valabhi. The Daṣakumāracharita (before 700 A. D.) and the Kathāsaritsāgara which though comparatively a modern work utilizes very old materials, mention Valabhi as an important place.

According to the Jaina tradition Devarddhigaṇi Kshamā Sramaṇa redacted the Jaina canon to its present form in the year 980 or 993 after Mahāvīra that is, in the year 453 A. D. or in the year 466 A. D., in the city of Valabhi. An assembly of all the learned Jaina monks was called and an authoritative form was finally given to the Jaina canon. This proves the prominence of the city of Valabhi at the very beginning of the Maitraka rule.

Yuan - Chang who came to Valabhi about the year 641 A. D. gives a description of the city which enables us to form some idea of its splendour. The Buddhist pilgrim says as follows:—

" This country (Fa-la-pi) is 6000 li or so in circuit, the capital about 30. The character of the soil, the climate and the manners of the people are like those of the kingdom of Mālavā. The population is very dense; the establishments rich. There are some hundred houses (families) or so, who possess a hundred lakhs. The rare and valuable products of distant regions are here stored in great quantities. There are some hundred saṅghārāmas with about 6000 priests. Most of them study the Little Vehicle, according to the Sammatiyā school. There are several hundred Deva temples with very many sectaries of different sorts.

When Tathāgata lived in the world, he often

travelled through this country. Hence Asoka - rāja raised monuments or built stūpas in all those places where Buddha rested. Scattered among these are spots where the three past Buddhas sat down, or walked, or preached the law. The present king is of the Kshattriya caste, as they all are. He is the nephew of Ṣilāditya - rājā of Mālvā, and son-in-law of the son of Ṣilāditya the present king of Kānyakubja. His name is Dhruvapata (T'u-lu-h'o-po-tu). He is of a lively and hasty disposition, his wisdom and statecraft are shallow. Quite recently he has attached himself sincerely to the faith in the three "precious ones." Yearly he summons a great assembly, and for seven days gives away most valuable gems, exquisite meats, and on the priests he bestows in charity the three garments and medicaments, or their equivalent in value, and precious articles made of rare and costly gems of the seven sorts. Having given this in charity he redeems them at twice their price. He esteems virtue (or the virtuous) and honours the good; he reverences those who are noted for their wisdom. The great priests who come from distant regions he particularly honours and respects.

Not far from the city is a great sanghārāma which was built by the Arhat ('O-che-lo); here the Bodhisattvas Guṇamati and Sthiramati (Kien - hwui) fixed their residences during their travels and composed treatises which have gained a high renown." (Bud. Records of the Western World - Beal Bk. XI pp. 266-267 - 268.)

The existence of many vihāras is, as we have, seen, attested by the several copper - plates of Valabhi.

Duddā - vihāra which seems to have developed into a vihāra - maṇḍala - a group of Vihāras containing within its precincts the vihāras built by Buddhadāsa (V. 217-536 A. D.), Gohaka (V. 310=629 A. D.), Sthiramati and Vimalagupta (V. 343=662 A. D.). The other vihāras in the city itself and near Valabhi were:—the Bhaṭṭārka-vihāra and a vihāra built by Her Worship Mimmā-near the Bhattārka - vihāra (V. 248=567 A. D.), Ṣrī Bappa - pādiya vihāra built by Sthiramati (V. 259=578 A. D.), - one built in Vamṣakaṭa by Ṣilāditya I, - one built by Punnabhaṭa in the vicinity of Yakshasūra - vihāra near Valabhi (V. 319=638 A. D.), and one built by the minister Skandagupta with a water - reservoir to supply water to the vihāra (V. 326=645 A. D.) and others.

The great sanghārama built by Arhat or Achara referred to by Yuan Chang has been identified with the caves in the Talaja hill (Bhavnagar State Kathiawad) by Mr. Hiralalal A. Shah. * This vihāra is the same as is mentioned in the copper - plate grant of Dharasena II of the year 259 (= 578 A. D.). It is described therein as "Ṣrī Bappapādiya vihāra caused by Āchārya Bhadanta Sthiramati in Valabhi." We are to understand that it was situated not actually in the city itself, but nearby; because to indicate in the city itself the words "Valabhi Svatalanivishṭa" are, generally, used. This agrees well with the description given by Yuan - Chang who says 'not far from the city.' Mr. Hiralal after comparing the other vihāras built by Achara which are identified with those of Ajanta and Nasik, comes to the conclusion that this vihāra of Achara also must be in a hill. This agrees very well with

* Purātattva Vol. 1, pp. 103-112.

the caves in the Talajā hill near Bhavnagar, which is not very far from Valabhi and the main door of whose principal assembly-hall looks over the old site of Valabhi. That Valabhi was a great seat of learning is again proved by 'I-tsing a junior contemporary' of Yuan - Chang. According to him "Nalanda in South Behar and Valabhi were two places in India which deserved comparision with the most famous centres of learning in China and were frequented by crowds of eager students who commonly devoted 2 or 3 years on attendance at lectures on Buddhist philosophy. This statement explains the assertion of Hiuen Tsang (Yuan Chang) that Mo-la P'o or Western Mālawa, and Magadha were the two countiies of India in which learning was prized, because Valabhi and Mo - la p'o were then politically one, both territories apparently being under the government of Dhruvabhaṭa, the son - in - law of King Harsha, paramount sovereign of Northern India." (Early His. of India — Smith: p. 314.)

Valabhi appears to have been a great centre of learning not only Buddhistic but Vedic and Jain also. We find in the 32nd taranga of the Kathāsaritsāgara (composed between 1063 - 1081 A. D.) that one Vishṇudatta native of Antarvedi goes to Valabhi for learning. + Again if there is anything which the grants attest quite definitely it is the royal patronage of Vedic learning throughout the whole kingdom. We saw that the learned Brāhmaṇas of Ānandapura

+ K. S. S. p. 141. (N. S. E.)
स विष्णुदत्तो वयसा पूर्णषोडशवत्सरः ।
गन्तुं प्रववृते विद्याप्राप्तये वलभीं पुरीम् ॥

(= modern Vadanagara) are conspicuous in the grants. The great Bhaṭṭikāvya – a veritable literary feat – which appears to have been the model of Hemachandra's Dvyāṣraya kāvya – was composed at Valabhi. This is merely a single literary remain which is, however, suggestive of a vast literary activity. This inference would appear right if we remember that the kings of Valabhi themselves are described as very learned. One of them Dhruvasena II is specially described as proficient in the science of Ṣālāturiya – that is –the Grammer of Pāṇini, and the Science of Polity.

Of the existence of Jaina learning, evidences are not wanting. We saw that in the beginning of the Maitraka rule Valabhi was the scene of a great Jaina scriptural activity. Under the supervision of Devarḍhigaṇi the whole Jaina canon was redacted to its present form. In fact this is one of the greatest events in Jaina history. We may also here refer to Mallavādin one of the greatest of Jaina dialecticians and the author of Nayachakra. According to the Prabhāvaka-charita Malla was the youngest of the three brothers – the name of the other two being Jitayaṣas or Jinayaṣas and Yaksha who lived in Valabhi with their mother whose name was Durlabhadevī. They had a maternal uncle who was a Ṣvetāmbara Jaina monk and was known as Jinānanda Sūrī. He was defeated by a Buddhist monk named Nanda or Buddhānanda in a public controversy at Bhṛgukachchha (Broach). He left that city and came to Valabhi where he made his nephew his disciples. All the three received high learning at Valabhi and became great masters of Ṣāstras. Jitayaṣas wrote a Nyasa – a sort of commentary – on a work of

grammar known as Viṣrāntavidyādharavara (probably only Viṣrānta Vidyādhara); × Yaksha composed a Samhitā known as Nimittāshṭāngabodhinī while Malla wrote his famous treatise on Jaina philosophy known as Nayachakra. Malla went to Broach and defeated his uncle's opponent Buddhānanda in a public controversy in the royal assembly. He was given the title of Vādin as a token of victory. There seems to be some truth in this episode. For we find that soon after the fall of Valabhi-power Buddhism gradually disappears from Gujarāt and Jainism taking its place. This may be due not a little to the controversies carried on by Mallavādin. *

As to the importance of Valabhi as a centre of trade and commerce we have sufficient evidence. We saw what Yuan-Chang says on this matter in his travels. The story-literature also bears testimony to this. For example, in the Daṣakumāracharita of Daṇḍin (before 700 A. D. - almost a contemporary) we find "There is a city named Valabhi in Saurāshṭra. In it there is an owner of ships named Gṛhagupta who can vie with Kubera in riches. He had a daughter named Ratnamatī. A merchant-prince named Bala-bhadra from Madhumatī (present day Mahuva) comes to Valabhi and marries her" etc. (p. 225). We find in this story Kheṭaka + associated with Valabhi. So also

× This work V. V. is referred to by Hemachandra in his grammar Siddha-Hema. Vāmana is said to be the author of the Viṣrānta-Vidyādhara. See the Purātattva, Vol. IV. p. 91.

* The story is somewhat differently told in the Prabandha-chintāmaṇi and the Prabandhakoṣa. There Malla is associated with Ṣilāditya.

+ The grants also associate Valabhi and Kheṭaka.

in the Kathāsaritsāgara we find a Vidyādhara, who had to take birth in the family of a merchant, being born in the city of Valabhi as a son to a very rich merchant and bearing the name of Vasudatta.÷ He is ordered by his father to go to other parts for business etc. (T. 22; p. 85). In the same work, again, we find Devasena of Pāṭaliputra going to Valabhi for trade - business × leaving his wife Kīrtisenā to the tender mercies of his mother. (Taranga 29 p. 130 K. S).

We pause here for a while to review the state of different religions in Gujarāt from the Kshatrapa rule to the Maitraka rule. Judging from the coins of Kshatrapas and the copper - plates of Maitrakas, we find that the state religion, or to be more precise, the royal religion was Ṣaivism. " This Ṣaivism seems to have been of the old Pāsupata school of Nakulisa or Lakulisa as the chief shrine of Lakulisa was at Karavana " (p. 83 B. G.). * As a result of the missionary activities of Asoka Buddhism seems to have made good head - way amongst the people as well as in the

÷ अचिरेणैव जातोऽह भूतले वणिजां कुले ।
नगर्यां वलभीनाम्न्यां महाधनवणिक्सुतः ।
वसुदत्ताभिधानः सन् वृद्धिं च गतवानहम् । (श्लो. ५९-६०)

× एकदा स पतिस्तस्या देवसेनो वणिज्यया ।
गन्तुं प्रववृते बन्धुप्रेरितो वलभीं पुरीम् ॥

* According to the latest researches of Mr. Ratnamaṇirao Skambha or Skambhatīrtha — the old Sanskṛta name for Khambhāta - was the original home of Linga - worship and that Gujarāt was known as Lāṭa to foreigners because it worshipped Lāṭa - or the stone - phallus. See for this interesting theory 'History of Khambhāta: by Mr. Ratnamaṇirao. Principal Anandshanker Dhruva, however, and some other scholars also, do not agree with this view.

nobility and also in royal families. Inscriptions of the followers of Buddhism of the time of Rudradāman and the copper-plates of Valabhi are evidences of this state of things. Guhasena in one of his plates is called Paramopāsaka-a great follower of Buddhism for which Duddā his paternal aunt seems to be responsible.

The spread of Jainism, though not so marked, is made evident by a Jaina inscription of the Kshatrapa period to which we have previously referred. According to Mr. Jayaswal Nahapāna was a Jaina. Be that as it may, at the time of Valabhi-supremacy Jainism seems to have made considerable progress; otherwise Devarddhigaṇi would have found it impossible to hold his council of Jaina monks in Valabhi. As a result of the activities of Mallavādin Jainism seems to have received fresh impetus.

Vaishṇavism seems to have received much support in the time of the Guptas. The Traikūṭaka kings were Parama-Bhāgavatas, so also Dharasena II. Dharapaṭṭa was a Paramāditya-bhakta or a great devotee of the Sun.

One fact, however, seems to come out clearly from the copper-plate grants of Maitraka kings, and that is, that the spirit of toleration and reverence for good things of all religions - taught by Aṣoka was not forgotten by subsequent rulers. Even though, almost all the kings of the Kshatrapa and the Maitraka periods were great devotees of Ṣiva, their gifts extended to all creeds and sects, especially, to Buddhism.

The copper-plates supply us with many details which enable us to visualize the administration of the kingdom of Valabhi. The B. G. gives a good summary which I quote in the footnote below.+

+ "The Valabhi grants supply information regarding the

As to the fall of Valabhi, Bühler, in 1872, confessed that it was a question most difficult to decide. Mr. Niharranjan Ray in his articles on the Maitrakas of Valabhi (Ind. Hist. Quarterly. September 1928) says that after so many years of research it is still one of the most difficult question to decide. The B. G. mainly relying upon the tradition mentioned by Alberuni places the sack of Valabhi about the year 770 A. D. (pp. 94 - 96).

As to the man who was mainly instrumental in bringing the foreigners to overthrow the king Śilāditya

---

leading office-bearers and the revenue police and village administrators whose names generally occur in the following order:

(1) Āyuktaka } meaning appointed, apparently any
(2) Viniyuktaka } superior officer.

(3) Drāngika, apparently an officer in charge of a town, as dranga means a town.

(4) Mahattara or Senior has the derivative meaning of high in rank. Mhātārā the Marathi for an old man is the same word. In the Valabhi plates mahattara seems to be generally used to mean the accredited headman of a village, recognised as a headman both by the people of the village and by the Government.

(5) Chāṭabhaṭa that is bhaṭas or sepoys for chāṭas or rogues, police mounted and on foot, represent the modern police Jamadars, havāladārs and constables. The KumārapālaCharita mentions that Chāṭabhaṭas were sent by Siddharāja to apprehend the fugitive Kumārapāla. One plate records the grants of a village 'unenterable by Chāṭabhaṭas.'

(6) Dhruva fixed or permanant is the hereditary officer in charge of the records and accounts of a village, the Talati and Kulkarni of modern times. One of the chief duties of the Dhruva was to see that the revenue farmers did not take more than the royal share. The name is still in use in Cutch where village accountants are called Dhru and Dhruva. Dhru is also a common surname among Nāgar Brāhamans and Modh and other Vanias in Cutch Gujarat and Kathiawada.

there is a general agreement in the traditions. It was Raṇka a Mārwādi merchant - prince, originally a very poor man coming from Pāli, and getting his fabulous wealth in Valabhi, who, as the author of the Prabandhachintāmaṇi says, "brought mud to his

(7) Adhikaraṇika means the chief judicial magistrate or judge of a place.

(8) Daṇḍapāṣika literally 'holding of the fetters or noose of punishment,' is used both of the head police officer and of the hangman or executioner.

(9) Chauroddharaṇika the thief - catcher. Of the two Indian ways of catching thieves, one of setting a thief to catch a thief, the other the Pagi or tracking system, the second answers well in sandy Gujarat and Kathiawada where the Tracker or the Pagi is one of the Barabalute or regular village servants.

(10) Rājasthāniya, the foreign secretary, the officer who had to do with other states and kingdoms rājasthānas. Some authorities take rājasthāniya to mean viceroy.

(11) Amātya minister and sometimes councillor is generally coupled with Kumāra or Prince.

(12) Anutpannadānasamudrāhaka the arrear-gatherer.

(13) Ṣaulkika the superintendent of tolls or customs.

(14) Bhogika or Bhogoddhāraṇika the collector of the Bhoga that is the state share of the land-produce taken in kind as a rule one-sixth. The term bhoga is still in use in Kathiawada for the share, usually one-sixth, which landholders receive from the cultivating tenants.

(15) Vartmapāla the roadwatch were often mounted and stationed in thanas or small roadside sheds.

(16) Prātisaraka patrols night-guards or watchmen of fields and villages.

(17) Vishayapati division - lord probably corresponded to the present subah.

(18) Rāshṭrapati the head of a district.

(19) Grāmakūṭa the village headmen." B. G. Vol. I pp. 81-82.

name by destroying his country" (deśabhangasamāsāditapanken Rankeṇa.).

As to the time when this event took place there are three dates given by Jaina writers. A gāthā quoted by Merutunga–the author of the Prabandhachintāmaṇi gives 475 V. S. (or as given by a different reading 375) (=419 (319) A. D.); Rājaśekharasūri – the author of the Prabandhakoṣa gives, 573 V. S. (=517 A. D.); while, Jinaprabhasūri – the author of the Vividhatīrthakalpa gives the year 845 V. S. (=789 A. D.). The first two dates are clearly unacceptable because, as we saw, the latest Valabhi grant discovered is that of the year 447 (=766 A. D.), unless we take them to refer to earlier sacks of Valabhi, which is not altogether improbable. The year given by Jinaprabhasūri – 845 V. S. (=789 A. D.) – seems to be correct. In the Arab references given in the B. G. (pp. 524–25), we find that the expedition of 776 A. D. though partially successful ended in disaster. This "dettered Al Mahdi (A. D. 775 – 785) the succeeding Khalifah from extending the eastern limits of his empire." From this we may conclude that the final Arab attack which with the help of the treacherous Ranka gave almost a death-blow to the city of Valabhi must have taken place after 785 A. D. This conclusion fits in very well with the date of Jinaprabhasūri; so we may further conclude that the glory of Valabhi was extinguished in the year 789 A. D.

"After the overthrow of Valabhi" says Vincent Smith. "its place as the chief city of Western India was taken by Aṇhilwada, which retained that honour until the fifteenth century, when it was superseded by Ahmedabad." (E. H. I. pp. 314 – 315). Before we

come to Aṇahilavāda, let us pause for a while to have a look at Bhinnamāla – which was, according to the Srimāla purāṇa (Adhyāyas 72, 75) the immediate source of men, money and culture of Aṇahilavāda.

11

The importance of Bhinnamāla or Srimāla in the history of Gujarat cannot be exaggerated. It was the first capital of Gurjaratrā–which means literally '(the land) protected by the Gurjaras' and which is the sanskritised form of the Prākṛta word Gujjarattā from which the modern word Gujarāta is derived. In other words, it was the first capital city of the Gurjaras who gave this province its present name. And, even after it ceased to be the capital, it was the people who hailed from Srīmāla that mostly made the history of Gujarāta. To the present day most of the Hindu population (in which term I include the Jainas also) of Gujarāt trace their origin to their connection with Srīmāla and its suburbs.

The first authentic source of information that we have about the Gurjara kingdom and its capital Bhinnamāla is, again, from the travels of Yuan – Chang who seems to have come to this part about 641 A. D. He says as follows:—

" Going north from the country of Valabhi 1800 li or so, we come to the kingdom of Kiu – che – lo (Gujjara)×.

× Julien restored the Sanskṛta name of the country Kiu–che–lo as Gurjjara. Mr. Watters thought that the 'pilgrim probably transcribed a name like Guchala or Guchara' (p. 250). Col. J. W. Watson identified Pi–lo–mo–lo with Bhinnamāla. Cunningham tells us that 'this city is exactly 300 miles to the north of the ruins of Valabhi' (p.).

This country is 5000 li or so in circuit. The capital which is called Pi-lo-mo-lo is thirty li or so round. The produce of the soil and the manners of the people resemble those of Ṣurāshṭra. The population is dense; the establishments are rich and well supplied with materials (wealth). They mostly are unbelievers; a few are attached to the law of Buddha. There is one Sanghā-rāma with about a hundred priests; they are attached to the teaching of the Little Vehicle and the school of the Sarvāstivādas. There are several tens of Deva temples, in which sectaries of various denominations dwell. The king is of the Kshatriya caste. He is just twenty years old; he is distinguished for wisdom, and he is courageous. He is a deep believer in the law of Buddha; and highly honours men of distinguished ability."

We may infer from this that in the first half of the seventh century A. D. Bhinnamāla which lies about fifty miles west of Mount Abu was known as the capital of a Gurjara kingdom whose circuit was more than 830 miles. In this connection, the Javanese tradition, which has already been discussed previously, may be referred to. According to it the prince Bhruvijaya Savelachala who came to Java about 603 A. D. was the son of Kasamachitra or Balya Acha who was king of Kujarāt. This word Kujarāt is restored to Gujarāta. Now if this tradition had a contemporary origin we may say that in the beginning of the seventh century a Gurjara kingdom existed in this part. From the copper-plates discovered in south Gujarāt the existence of 'a small Gurjara kingdom in and about Bharucha about A. D. 580 to 808 is inferred' (B. G. p. 113). From a copper-plate of the year V. S. 900 (=844 A. D.) of the Pratihāra king Bhoja I discovered from a temple

in ruins in the village Siva in Jodhpura state we learn that the village Siva which was in the Dendvāṇaka district of Gurjaratrābhūmī (Gurjarat land or Gurjara-land) was given in gift. A stone - inscription of the ninth century A. D. discovered at Kalinjare mentions a village named Mangalānaka which is also a village in the Jodhpura state as situated in Gurjaratrā–maṇḍala. Two inscriptions of V. S. 918 (=862 A. D.) discovered from the village of Ghatiale in the Jodhpura state - one in Sanskṛta and the other in Prakṛta - mention Gurjaratrā and Gujjarattā respectively.

All these pieces of evidence, though fragmentary, make it probable that the dominion of the Gurjaras was extensive. If the Gurjara kingdom of Bharucha may be regarded as the remnant of a Gurjara empire one may say that the Gurjaras might have spread upto Narmadā in the south. The northern limit would be the eastern part of Jodhpura state.*

Now we have to face the questions who were the Gurjaras, when did they occupy Bhinnamāla, and when did they spread over the whole province which was named after them.

The earliest reference to the Gurjaras as yet discovered in Samskṛta literature is to be found in the Harshacharita of Bāṇa a protègè of Ṣri Harsha. There we find that Prabhākaravardhana the father of Ṣrī Harsha is called Gurjara - prajāgara, that is, according to the commentary Samketa ' one who deprived the Gurjaras of their sleep,' or it may mean, ' one who was wakeful,

* See Pandit Gaurishankar Oza's Rajputānekā Itihāsa part I. pp. 130–133 and also his articles in the Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā New series Vol. III pp. 341–46.

that is, on his guard against Gurjars.' This will carry us to the latter half of the sixth century A. D. – the period of Harsha being 606 A. D. to 647 A. D. According to Smith the Gurjaras whom Prabhākara-vardhana defeated were "probably those of Rajputānā, but possibly those of the Gurjara kingdom in the Punjab, now represented by Gujarāt and Gujaranwala Districts." (p. 336 E. H I.). If the Gurjaras were those of Bhinnamāla we can say that they were ruling there in the sixth century, and if they were those of the Punjab we may guess that some of them might have been compelled to leave the Punjab and come to Bhinnamāla in the latter half of the sixth century.

The generally accepted view about the origin of Gurjaras is that 'they were foreign immigrants' and were 'closely associated with, and possibly allied in blood to the white Huns' (p. 321, E. H. I.).* Pandit Gaurishankara Oza – the great historian of Rajputānā, has very ably controverted the prevalent view about the foreign origin of the mediaeval royal dynasties of India, including that of Gurjara dynasty in his 'History of Rajputana Part I (pp. 36 – 67 and 133 – 134). We cannot enter into the merits of his arguments here, but this much may be said that from a strictly logical point of view, the question is still unanswered and some of the arguments of the learned Pandita are unanswerable. One strong argument, however, in favour of the foreign origin and late advent of Gurjaras into India is that they are

* Cunningham connects Huns with Yuechi that is Kuṣaṇas while Dr. Devadatta Bhandarkar following Sir James Campbell connects them with the Khajara tribe.)

not mentioned in the tribal lists of the Mahābhārata or any other Samskṛta work earlier than the Harshacharita.

Another important question is whether Chāpas, Chāvoṭakas or Chāvaḍas, Pratihāras of Bhinnamāla and later on of Kanauja, the Solankis and other ruling tribes of Gujarāta were of the Gurjara origin or that they were simply called Gurjaras because they ruled or belonged to the province which was already known as Gurjaradeṣa or Gurjaratrā-bhūmi. Pandita Oza holds the latter view. According to him the Gurjara rule had ended in Bhinnamāla before the coming of Yuan - Chang or before the completion of Brahma-sphutasiddhānta of the astronomer Brahmagupta who is called Bhillamālikāchārya in the Saka Samvat 550 that is, 628 A. D.; because, the king who was ruling then in Bhinnamāla was one Vyāghramukha belonging to the Chāpa dynasty (Rājputānekā Itīhāra part I pp. 132–133). If we accept this view we will have to assume that the Gurjara power spread over the whole of Gujarāta and part of Rajputānā before or by the beginning of the sixth century A. D.. For this, however, we have no corroborating evidence. Pandita Oza himself confesses that 'it is not certain when the rule of Gurjaras began and how long it lasted.' There is nothing improbable, however, in the Chāpas, Pratihāras, etc. originally belonging to the wider Gurjara clan; and I think the simultaneous mention of Chāvoṭakas, Gurjaras etc. in inscriptions should not be made much of. It is not difficult to find wider clans and castes mentioned with their sub-clans or sub-castes. For example, we know that the Vāghelas were a branch of the Solankis; yet we find Vāghelas and Solankis mentioned together.

Similarly, though the Prāgvāṭas are also Śrīmālis they are often mentioned with them. The same is true about other castes. For example, some of the Vadanagar Brāhmaṇas call themselves Nāgars, and call the others Brāhmaṇas. That does not mean that Nāgaras will cease to be Brāhmaṇas if they may be simultaneously mentioned with Brāhmaṇas. If we accept the suggestion that the Chāpas, Pratihāras etc. were Gurjaras we can explain with greater probability and plausibility the spread of Gurjara power as well as the name Gurjaratrā over the whole of the province.*

Mr. Jackson in his excellent monograph on Bhinnamāla published as an appendix to the B. G. Vol. I gives a detailed account of the ruins of the city, of the objects of interest in it, of its surroundings, of its history, and inscriptions discovered there.

From this we gether that Bhinnamāla must have been a magnificent city. "The site of the city is in a wide plain about fifteen miles west of the last outlier of the Ābu range. To the east, between the hills and Bhinnamāla, except a few widely-seperated village sites, the plain is chiefly a grazing ground with brakes of thorn and cassia bushes overtopped by standards of the camel-loved pilu Salvadora persica. To the south, the west, and the north the plain is smooth and bare passing westwards into sand. From the level of the plain

* According to Dr. Devadatta Bhandarkar Gurjaratrā was originally only a province in Rajputana. The present-day province got its name after the Solankis became its rulers when the Gurjars first entered it and gave it the name Gurjaratrā or Gujarāta. Mr. N. B. Divetia seems to agree with this view. (Gujarati Language & Literature. p. 38.).

stand out a few isolated blocks of hill, 500 to 800 feet high, of which one peak, about a mile west of the city, is crowned by the shrine of Chāmuṇḍā the Ṣrī or Luck of Bhinnamāla. From a distance the present Bhinnamāla shows few traces of being the site of an ancient capital. Its 1500 houses cover the gentle slope of an artificial mound the level of their roofs broken by the spires of four Jain temples and by the ruined state office at the south end of the mound. Closer at hand the number and the size of old stone-stripped tank and fortification-mounts and the large areas honeycombed by the diggers for bricks show that the site of the present Bhinmal was once the centre of a great and widespread city." (B. G. Vol. I, p. 449.)

For Ṣrīmāla we are fortunate in possessing another important source of information viz. Ṣrīmāla-māhātmya or S. Purāṇa.+ This Purāṇa, in a legendary form, gives much interesting information about the city of Ṣrīmāla. A brief summary of this account will give some idea of its historical importance.

The site which ultimately became known as Ṣrīmāla was in the beginning known as Gautamāṣrama-the hermitage of the sage Gautama. Gautama was asked

+ According to some these two are different works. Mr. Jackson takes this Purāṇa to be four hundred years old. We gather from the S. Purāṇa that Gautama created 84 Jaina gachchhas out of which Tapa-gachchha was the principal (A. 74 v. 54.). Tapa-gachchha was started in the year V. S. 1285-1229 A. D. The mention of eighty four gachchhas indicates a still later date. See the Jaina S. S. Vol I No. 3 p. 39. As in the case of other Purāṇas, however, information contained in this also may be much older than the final redaction of the Purāṇa.

12

by Ṣiva himself to go to that place where there was a lake known as Traiyambaka lake. This lake is described as being situated to the north of the mountain Saugandhika (that is the mountain near Sugandhā that is modern Nasik) and to the north–west of the mountain Ābu. * Near this lake was a forest sacred to Varuṇa and known as Varuṇa–kānana because Varuṇa got his overlordship of the West by practising penance there. Gautama founded his hermitage there occupying an area of five gavyūtis – that is about ten miles, and resided there with his wife Ahilya and disciples. × This place later on became Ṣrīmāla.

The mythical explanation of the name Ṣrīmāla is interesting. Ṣrī or Lakshmi was born as a daughter to the sage Bhṛgu and was married to Vishṇu. As she was flying over the place with her Lord and other gods they stopped at the place. It was after bathing in the lake Traiyambaka that Ṣrī remembered her true self. On the occasion of Ṣrī's self – realization gods covered the whole place with mālās–that is garlands– of divine flowers. Consequently the whole site of five krosas which was occupied by the vimānas of the gods was named at the request of Srī as Ṣrīmāla. She gave the whole place as a gift to Brāhmaṇas, and

* अस्ति सौगन्धिकादद्रेरुत्तरस्यां दिशि द्विज ।
वायव्यामर्बुदारण्यात् सिद्धगान्धर्वसेवितम् ।
सरस्त्रैयम्बकं नाम सर्वपापप्रणाशनम् ॥ अ. २ श्लो. २२–२३.

× Brahmā, Vishṇu and Maheṣa – the Divine Trinity and other gods and goddesses were requested to reside there. The sage Devala who went on a pilgrimage to that place uttered the following verse being impressed with its holiness:

एकतस्त्र्यम्बकं सरश्चैकतो गौतमाश्रमः ॥
अत्रान्तरे तनुत्यागान्न भूयो जायते नरः ॥ A. 4. V. 51.

expressed her intention to keep a part of herself there. Vishṇu asked the Gaṇas to bring holy Brāhmaṇas from different parts of the country and asked Viṣvakarmā to build in the meanwhile a city on the site. The divine architect built a magnificent city which is beautifully described in the Ṣrīmāla Purāṇa.* The city was inspected by Ṣrī, Vishṇu, and other gods from air and they expressed their satisfaction with the words 'Oh lovely ! lovely ! What beauty ! What magnificence !'+

Ṣrī, being completely satisfied, gave Visvakarmā–celestical hasta-sūtras–armlets (literally threads for arms) and golden lotus garlands; while Vishṇu gave him a boon which is historically significant. " The best of Brāhmaṇas will study the science of architecture that you have created as if it were a dharmaṣāstra (religious work). Without doubt you will be the first of architects who will honour you when they build palaces and houses." When we remember the architectural heritage of Gujarat and the class of master - builders who created it, this promise seems to have been properly fulfilled.×

---

* See. Adhāyas 9 (verses 1–22), 10 (vs. 2–24), and *72* (verse 1–15).

\+ अहोरम्यमहो रूपमहो महः ।

× परितुष्टा ततो देवी प्रददौ विश्वकर्मणे ।
हस्तसूत्राणि द्विव्यानि स्रजं च कनकाम्बुजां ॥
प्रददौ देवदेवोऽपि वर तस्मै गदाधरः । ३०
त्रिषु लोकेषु शालानां यत्कृत शास्त्रमुत्तमम् ।
धर्मशास्त्रमिव प्रीत्या पठिष्यन्ति द्विजोत्तमा ॥ ३१
त्वदाद्याः शिल्पिनः सर्वे भवितारो न संशयः ।
लोके निष्पद्यमानेषु प्रासादेषु गृहेषु च ।
अर्चयिष्यन्ति मर्त्यास्त्वां सर्वे कामार्थसिद्धये ॥ ३२

The holy Brāhmaṇas came and received the free gift of the city from Ṣrī, giving Gautama the place of honour. The Brāhmaṇas from the Sindha – forest, however, did not accept the leadership of Gautama and were, therefore, expelled.

The city then, after the site on which it was built, became known as Ṣrīmālanagara. This, according to the Purāṇa, was the name of the city in the Satya Yuga. Its name in the Tretā Yuga was Pushpamāla, while in the Kalī Yuga is Bhinnamāla or Bhillamāla. * Its fourth name is indicated in the Purāṇa+ and mentioned in the Prabandhachintāmaṇi viz. Ratnamāla in connection with the story of the king Ṣrī Punja and his daughter Ṣrīmātā.

It is possible to form some idea of the extent of the city. According to the Ṣrīmāla Purāṇa, as we saw, the extent of the Gautamāṣrama was five gavyutis, that is roughly about fifteen miles. The area of the city occupied by big mansions was equal to the area occupied by the vimānas of the gods that is five kroṣas roughly ten miles.× The whole vistāra – or extent of the city is described as five yojanas that is roughly fifteen to twenty miles.

The form of the city was square.‡

The Purāṇa gives certain figures about Ṣrīmāla, calling it Ṣrīmālikī sarvasamkhyā – that is ' all figures

---

* पुष्पमाला मया कण्ठे कश्यपस्य निवेशिता ।
त्रेतादौ पुष्पमालेति नाम्ना श्रीमालमस्त्विति ॥ A. 45. V. 56.

+ See Adhyāya 66.

× See Adhyāya 3 (V. 124–25), and 8 (Vs. 14, and 37, 38.

‡ A. 10. V. 58. पञ्चयोजनविस्तारं चतुरस्रं समन्ततः ।

of Srīmāla.' According to this there were 1000 Gaṇāpatis, 4000 Kshetrapālas, 84 Chandikā Devīs, 1000 lakes, 11000 Sivalingas, 999 principal temples and 18000 Durgā - temples.

There were 4000 Brahmaṣālas and 8000 shops, and 1000 assemblies.

The city had 84 gates+ in the wall fortifying it.*

Those vaishyas who stayed in the eastern part of the city were known as Prāgvāṭas, in the southern as Dhanotkaṭas and in the western and northern as Srimālins.×

We find corroboration for this account from the description given by Yuan - Chang. According to him " Pi - lo - mo - lo is 30 li or so round " that is, about six miles; " the population is dense, the establishments are rich (well) supplied with materials." Prabhāchandrasurī the author of the Prabhāvakacharita (V. S. 1334 A. D. 1278) describes this magnificent city as follows:—

" In Gurjaradeṣa or Gurjaraland which is the abode of perennial wealth there is a city called Srīmāla which is like the face of the earth damsel. The rows of the kumbhas on its temples appear like jewels on the city's crest. It is adorned with magnificent palaces

+ Adhyāya 71. The Purāṇa gives the figures about the population of the city also.

* " Of its fortifications, which, as late as A. D. 1611, the Engligh merchant Nicholas Ufflet, in a journey from Jhalor to Ahmedabad, describes as enclosing circuit of thirty-six miles (24 koṣa) containlng many fine tanks going to the ruins, almost no trace remains." (B. G. p. 449.)

× A. 13. V. 25.

प्राग्वाटा दिशि पूर्वस्यां दक्षिणस्यां धनोत्कटा ।
श्रीमालिनः प्रतीच्यां वै उत्तरस्यां तथाऽविशन् ॥

beautified by Mattavāraṇa* and its main roads are decorated by the presence of mighty elephants. There are also beautiful Jaina temples and great sages in the city."

Mr. Jackson describes in detail the Jaikopa (Yaksha-kūpa) or Yaksha Well and the temple of Jagatsvāmi–the Sun. × The most interesting thing near the lake is a massive broken statue. Mr. Jackson after describing the statue in detail says " In spite of its featureless face and its broken hands and feet the figure has considerable dignity. The head is well set and the curls and diadem are an effective ornament. The chest and the full rounded belly are carved with skill. The main fault in proporation, the over–shortened lower arm and leg and the narrowness of the throne, are due to the want of depth in the stone. The chief details of interest are the figure's head–dress and the ball of stone in its right hand. The head–dress seems to be a wig with a row of crisp round curls across the brow and four lines of long curls hanging down to the shoulders and the crisp curls on the top of the head. The mukuṭa or diadem has three upright faces, a front face over the nose and side faces over the ears joined together by two rounded bands. At first sight the stone - ball in the right hand seems a cocoanut which the king might hold in dedicating the lake." Examination shows it to be a human head. (B. G. P. 457.)

" The appearance of the figure, its massive well

---

* An architectural term meaning a projecting part of a house looking like a protruded neck. प्रग्रीवो मत्तवारणे अ. चि. ४–७८.

× For Yaksha-kūpa-māhātmya see Adhyāya 22 and for Jagatsvāmin see A. 43 of Ṣrimāla Purāṇa.

proportioned and dignified pose, and the long wig-like curls, like the bag wig on the figure of Chand on the south-west or marriage compartment of the great Elephanta Cave, make it probable that this statue is the oldest relic of Shrimal, belonging like the Elephanta wigged figures to the sixth or early seventh century the probable date of the founding or refounding of the city by the Gurjjaras." (B. G. P. 458).

'According to the dates preserved by the local tradition, the first temple of Jagat Svami, or the Sun was built in in 222 S. V. (=166 A. D. ?) The city was destroyed in S. V. 265 (=209 A. D.). In S. V. 494 (=438 A.D.) the city was sacked second time by a Rakshasa. In S. V. 700 (=643 A. D.) the city was re-built. In S.V. 900 (=844 A. D.) it was destroyed for the third time. In S. V. 955 (=896 A. D.) the city was again restored and it was followed by a period of prosperity till the beginning of the 14th century. ' (B. G. P. 463.)

The first authentic source of information about Bhinnamāla is an inscription of Varmalāta who according to the Prabhāvakacharita was a king of Bhinnamāla. This inscription is dated V. S. 682 (=626 A. D.). This is probably the same Varmalāta who is referred to by Māgha in the Praṣasti of his Mahākāvya Ṣiṣupālavadha. If the identity is accepted we can place Māgha who according to the tradition was a poet of Ṣrīmāla 50 years after this or considering the reference to Nyāsa about 700 A.D. (See Keith Samskṛta Literature); for Suprabhadeva, the grand-father of Māgha was the prime minister of Varmalāta; the name of the poet's father being Dattaka who was addressed as Sarvāṣraya by the people for his friendliness towards all. It may be that Māgha

ended every canto of his poem with the word 'Ṣrí' for which he is called 'Ṣrayanka' with a view to commemorate his city Ṣrimāla in his epic.

While describing the surroundings of Bhinnamāla Mr. Jackson refers to a large area rough with heaps of bricks which is said to be the site of an old Vidyāṣālā or Samskrta College.

According to S. Purāṇa there were one thousand Brahmasālās and four thousand maṭhas where the different branches of learning were taught.+ It says :

प्रत्यूषे ब्रह्मघोषेण देवशङ्खस्वनेन च ।
गवां हुंकारशब्देन वत्सानां वासितेन च ॥
श्रीमालमभवद् भूप बाह्याभ्यन्तरं शुचि ॥ ४
धर्मशास्त्राण्यनूच्यन्ते सरहस्यानि सर्वतः ।
सहोपनिषदो वेदाश्छन्दो व्याकरणानि च ॥ ७ अ. ४२.

And in A. 71 v. 9 :

चतुर्वेदाः साङ्गाश्च त्वुपनिषत्सहितास्तथा ।
सर्वशास्त्राणि वर्तन्ते श्रीमाले श्रीनिकेतने ॥

This tradition of Ṣrimāla being a great centre of learning is corroborated from other sources also. We saw that the great poet Māgha flourished in this city. We also know that the great astronomer Bhillamallakāchārya Brahmagupta completed his treatise on artronomy known as Brahmasphutasiddhānta in Ṣaka 550 (=628 A. D.). Albureni (A. D. 1020) says that 'the Brahmasphuṭatasiddhānta was composed by Brhamagupta the son of Jishnu from the town of Bhinnamāla between Multan and Anhilwada.'

Ṣrīmāla was also a great place of Jaina learning. The famous Upamitibhavaprapanchākathā of Siddharshi was finished in V. S. 962 (906 A. D.) at Bhinnamāla.

+ See S. Māhātmya A. 12. v. 22; and also A. 71.

It was also one of the centres of literary activity of Haribhadrasūri the author of many important works on Jaina philosophy and also of a general work on the Schools of Indian Philosophy known as Shad–Darśana–samuchchaya. He also composed the Samarāditya-Kathā a novel whose hero is Samarāditya. This work is mentioned as a sakalakathā in the K. S. It is this Haribhadrasūri who is credited with proselytizing a number of Prāgvāṭas who, later on, played a very important part in the history of Aṇahilavāda Patan. Siddharshī who according to the Prabhāvakacharita was a citizen of Ṣrīmāla was also a disciple of Haribhadrasūri. It was for his sake that the commentary Lalitavistarā was composed by Haribhadrasūri.

The Prākṛta novel 'Kuvalayamālā – Kathā' of Uddyotanasūri, which was so effectively utilized in settling the date of Haribhadrasūri by that great scholar Muni Ṣrī Jinavijayaji,* was completed at 'Ṣrī Bhinnamāla Nagara' 'in the afternoon of the last but one day of the year 700 of the Ṣaka Kāla.' The author ends his work with the words : "This has not been composed with the pride of being a poet or with the intention of writing poetry. It has been composed because it is a Dharma – kathā. Therefore, do not look to its demerits." These few instances will suffice to give an idea of the active literary life of Ṣrīmāla, which was the immediate inspiring model of Aṇahilvāda – Pātana. The part that Haribhadrasūri played at Ṣrīmāla must have inspired not a little the ambition of Hemachandra.

Having noted the Purāṇic explanation of the name

*See the Vasanta Rajata Mahotsava Smārakagrantha.

Ṣrīmāla, let us, before we come to the religious and political history, see if it is possible to have an historical and more rational account of this place-name. In all the four names viz. Bhinna or Bhillamāla, Ṣrīmāla, Pushpamāla and Ratnamāla–the word māla is common. Now the word māla has three meanings – a forest between two villages, a hilly piece of land and a mlechchha jāti + – a non - aryan foreign or aboriginal tribe. All the three meanings will suit the context, but the name of Kaliyuga viz. Bhillamāla seems to be the first historical name while the others are laudatory names. It is a known fact that many tracts become known by the name of the tribes who reside there. This particular tract in the beginning must have been occupied by the aborigines known as Bhillas and Mālas and must have therefore been known as Bhillamāla. As the city prospered, its proud dwellers must have tried to change the name to Ṣrīmāla, though, as we have seen before, Brahmagupta the famous astronomer of the early part of the seventh century A. D. calls himself a Bhillamālakāchārya. The frequent troubles, according to the Purāṇa and local tradition, caused by the Rākshasas to the city might have been nothing else than the rebellions of these Bhillas and Mālas who were deprived of their possessions. One of the holy places described by the S. Purāṇa bears the name of Kairāta Lake, that is a lake sacred to a Kirāta or Bhilla. ×

+ See Abhidhāna-Chintamaṇi.

माला भिल्लाः किराताश्च सर्वेऽपि म्लेच्छजातयः ॥ का. ४, श्लो. ५९८. and मालं ग्रामान्तराटवी । का. ४. श्लो. २९ ॥ According to Mallinātha (M. D. V. 16) मालं शैलप्रायमुन्नतस्थलम् ।

× See A. 19. The name of the Kirāta was Jhinjhira.

We may here briefly refer to the religious history of Śrīmāla. From the S. Purāṇa we gather that it was a place of Śaiva and Vaishṇava worship. But from the same source we learn that Jaina religion became predominant in the Kali Yuga.* From Yuan-Chang we learn that Buddhism also prevailed there in his time.

Now we come to a short account of the political history of Bhinnamāla. After Varmalāta (A. D. 626), Vyāghramukha the king of the Chāpa dynasty was reigning in the year 628 A. D. When Yuan-Chang came about 641 A. D. there was a Kshatriya king who was 20 years of age. He might have been a son of Vyāghramukha. In the copper-plate grant of the Chālukya Sāmanta Pulakeśin of the Kalachuri Samvat 490 (740 A. D.) there is a reference to Chāotakas being attacked by the Mussalmans. If they were the chāpas of Bhinnamāla, we can say that Bhinnamāla must have been attacked between the years 732 and 740 A. D. +

After the Chāotakas we find Pratihāras reigning in Bhinnamāla. It is not known when the Chāpas were displaced by the Pratihāras. Pandit Gauriśankar Oza puts this event between 740 and 809 A. D.

The first Pratihāra king that we know of is Nāgabhatta or Nāgāvaloka. If he is the same Nāgabhaṭṭa who is mentioned in the copper-plate grant of the Chauhan king Bhartṛvṛddha II of the V. S. 813 (=757 A. D.) discovered in the village of Hansot in the Broach District, in which Bhartṛvṛddha is called

---

* See A. 73. जैनधर्मे च श्रीमाले चरिष्यन्ति कलौ युगे ॥ ८७

+ For an alternative view see the next section on Chavaḍas.

a sāmanta of Nāgāvaloka, we can say that his dominion extended 'from Mārwād in the north to Broach in the south.' In his time the Baluchis made an expedition against his kingdom but were defeated.

Then, we pass over to two other kings–Kākutstha and Devarāja–and come to Vatsarāja. He conquered the Gauda kings of Bengal. When he was engaged in fighting with a king of Mālavā, he was attacked by the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Dhruvarāja who ultimately defeated him. Vatsarāja had to flee back to his country Māravāḍa and hand over the two white umbrellas which he had taken from the Gauda king to the Rāshṭrakūṭa king. He is referred to in the Jaina Harivamṣapurāṇa composed by the Jaina Digambara Āchārya Jinasena in Ṣaka Samvat 705 (= 783 A. D.). He is also referred to by Uddyotanasūri in his Kuvalayamālā–kathā (p. 271).

He was succeeded by his son Nāgabhatta II. He was also called Nāgāvaloka. He defeated Chakrāyudha the king of Kanouj and thus became the lord of an empire. We know from the Gwalior inscription that he conquered the kings of Andhra, Saindhava, Vidarbha, Kalinga and Vanga and took the mountain–castles of Ānartta, Mālavā, Kirāta, Turushka, Vatsa, and Matsya. We have an inscription of him V. S. 772 (=716 A. D.) found from Buchakala a village in the Jodhapura state. He was a great devotee of Bhagavatī. This Nāgabhaṭṭa is also called Āma by the Jaina writers. According to the Prabhavakacharita he died in V. S. 890 (=834 A. D.). Probably it was in his time that Bhinnamāla ceased to be the capital of Gurjara empire and only remained a provincial capital. The seat of the Gurjara empire then became Kānyakubja.

We pass over his son Rāmachandra and come to Bhoja Deva who was the most powerful king of the Pratihāra dynasty. We have about five inscriptions of his time ranging from V. S. 900 to 939 (=844-883 A. D.). His silver and copper coins bearing on one side the legend Ṣrī Mahādivarāha ' and on the other an image of Bow have also been discovered. He was also a devotee of Bhagavatī. His queen's name was Chandrabhattārikā Devī. A sixth inscription of his has been discovered in Kathiawad which shows that his sway extended to that province also.

" Bhoja " to quote Smith " enjoyed a long reign of about half a century (C. 840-90 A. D.) and beyond question was a very powerful monarch whose dominions may be called an empire without an exaggeration." (E. H. I. p. 397.) " Unfortunately, no Magesthenese or Bāṇa has left a record of the nature of his internal government " (Ibid p. 380).

He was succeeded by his son Mahendrapāla. He is also called Nirbhayarāja or Nirbhaya-narendra. Two of his inscriptions and three of his copper-plates have been found dating from V. S. 950 to V. S. 967 (=894-911 A. D.) Two of the copper-plates were found in the village of Una in the Junagadha state. That proves his suzerainty over that part. He had appointed a governor whose name was Dhiyaka and who was administrating the province on his behalf.

His teacher was the famous poet and critic Rājaṣekhara who is the author of a work on Poetics called the Kāvyamīmāṃsā, and of the plays, Karpūramanjarī Viddhaṣālabhanjika, Bālarāmāyaṇa and Bālabhārata. We find that Hemachandra has

borrowed many passages from the Kāvyamīmāmsā in his Kāvynuṣāsana. Mahendrapāla was also a devotee of Bhagavatī.

He was succeeded by Mahīpāla. He is known also by the name of Kshitipāla Rājaṣekhara was living in his time also. He refers to him in the prologue of his play Bālabhārata, as the Mahārājādhirāja of Āryāvarta and the conqueror of Murala Mekala, Kalinga etc. He fought with Rāshṭrakūṭa king Indrarāja III and was defeated according to the account of the Rāshṭrakūṭas. A copper-plate of his has been found in the village of Hadala in Kathiawad of Ṣaka samvat 836 (=914 A. D.), from which we learn that a feudatory of his named Dharaṇīvarāha of the Chāpa dynasty, was reigning there. Another inscription of his dated V. S. 974 (=918 A. D.) has also been found.

He was succeeded by three kings: Bhoja II, Vinayapāla, the younger brother of Bhoja and Mahendrapāla II, the son of Vinayapāla. In his time Gujarat seems to have become independent under Mularāja Solanki of Aṇahilavāda Pāṭaṇa. (See Nāgari Prachāriṇi Patrika — New series Vol. IX; pp. 320–27).

In this period upto 953 A. D. Bhinnamāla seems to have continued as the most important city in Gujarāta. Immediately after that during the reign of one Bhimasena a migration of 18,000 Gurjaras from Bhinnamāla is recorded. * "An important result of this abandoment of Bhinnamāla was the transfer of overlordship from Bhinnamāla to Aṇahilavāda". (B. G. p. 469).

* According to the Ṣrīmāla Purāṇa Ṣrī left that city in the V. S. 1203=1147 A. D.

12

Now we come to the history of the Aṇahilavāḍa kingdom.

For the early history of Aṇahilavāḍa - Pattana and its Chāvadā rulers, we have no contemporary records, either inscriptional or literary. The earliest reference to the Chāvaḍās of Aṇahilavāda is in the Vadnagara inscription dated V. S. 1208 - A. D. 1152 in the reign of Kumārapāla. The earliest reference to the name of Vanarāja, the first Chāvadā king of Aṇahilavāda is of the year V. S. 1216 (= A. D. 1160) in the colophon of an Apabhramṣa work called Neminātha-chariu of one Haribhadra Sūri who completed the work in that year in the residence provided by the minister Pṛthvīpāla in the reign of Kumārapāla. This praṣasti or colophon which is published by Prof. Jacobi at the end of his edition of Sanatkumāracharitam (p. 152) is a very important historical document as it narrates the history of an influential family in which was born the famous general Vimala who built on Mount Ābu that great work of art-the temple known as Vimalavasahi. It also gives some interesting information about the reign of Vanarāja to which we shall refer at the proper place. The Moharājaparājaya of Yaṣahpāla which was acted in the reign of Ajayapāla (V. S. 1229 - 1232 = A. D. 1173 - 1176) also makes mention of Vanarāja and the excessive addiction of Chāvadās to drinking liquors.

The Prabhāvakacharita of Prabhāchandra Sūri (circa V. S. 1334 = A. D. 1278) throws light on the rights given by Vanarāja to Chaityavasi monks as

against the Suvihita monks. The Sukṛtasamkīrtana of Arisimha (about V. S. 1278-1287=A. D. 1222-1231) is the first work which describes all the kings of Chāvaḍā dynasty in regular succession. The commentary of Abhayatilakagaṇi on the Dvyāṣraya of Hemachandra which was completed in the year V. S. 1312=A. D. 1256 mentions the story of the shepherd Aṇahilla who showed Vanarāja the site for founding the city named after him. The most important work, however, which provides ample material for the whole history of Aṇahilavāda kingdom is the Prabandhachintāmaṇi of Merutunga (about V. S. 1361 = A. D. 1305). It is the first work which gives a regular chronology for the history of Gujarat from the founding of Aṇahilavāda Pattana in the year V. S. 802 (= A. D. 746) to the year V. S. 1277 -(A. D. 1221), when Vastupāla went to pilgrimage. Another work which gives the chronology for this period differing in some points from that of the Prabandhachintāmaṇi is the Sthavirāvalī or Vichārāṣreṇī of Merutunga (about V. S. 1400 = A. D. 1344) who has been mistakenly identified with the author of the P. C. though really a different person.

A collection of old prabandhas edited and published by Muni Jinavijaya under the title of Purātanaprabandha Samgraha supplies many dates and details for the history of Aṇahilavāda. It appears that many of these prabandhas were the original source of the P. C. and later works.

The Vividhatīrthakalpa of Jinaprabhasūri (about V. S. 1364=A. D. 1308) whice is a sort of guide-book of Jaina Tīrthas of the fourteenth century is a veritable mine of materials for the history of Gujarat.

The Ratnamālā of Krshṇa Kavi, a work in Hindi language of the seventeenth or the eighteenth century is 'a poetic history with good descriptions and many fables taken from the Prabandhachintāmaṇi' (B. G. p. 149 f. n. 2). The Purāna of the Modhera Brāhmaṇas also supplies scme interesting material.

A careful study of these works makes evident the earlier existence of traditional chronicles oral as well as written.

Coming to the history of Chavaḍā-clan which is also referred to under the Sanskritized forms Chāpotkaṭa or Chāvoṭaka or simply Chāpa-we find that there is evidence to prove the existence of two kingdoms different from one established at Aṇahilavāda. The first is that of the Chāpa king Vyāghramukha of Bhinnamāla to which we have already referred. The second is that of Dharaṇīvarāha of Wadhavāṇ in Kathiawad who was subordinate to the Pratihāra emperor of Kanauj about the year 914 A. D. (R. I. pp. 144-149).

We have no definite information as to the connection of the Bhinnamāla Chāpas or earlier Chāpotkaṭas of Wadhavan, if any, with the Chāvaḍas of Aṇahilavāda. We may here note that according to a verse in the B. P. ms of the P. C. the lord of the Chāpotkaṭas is said to be in the family (vamṣe) of King Haihaya. We, however, require more evidence to make the significance of this relation more definite.

The Ratnamālā of Krshṇa Kavi narrates the story of Jayaṣekhara-the Chavaḍā king of Panchāsara. According to this account, Jayaṣekhara was attacked by Bhuvada of Kalyāṇakaṭaka in V. S. 752, i. e. A. D.

696 The city of Panchāsara was beseiged by the attacking army. The siege continued for fifty-two days. When Jayaṣekhara saw that he could no longer hold against the enemy, he sent away his queen Rūpasundarī who was pregnant, to a forest near by with her brother Surapala who was his general. Jayaṣekhara met with a heroic death in open battle. In the forest Rūpasundari gave birth to a son who was later on known as Vanarāja.

This account of Jayaṣekhara is not given by any other work. The Purātanaprabandhasamgraha tells a different tale about the parentage of Vanarāja. It says "In the village of Ambāsara, there lived two brothers named Chaṇḍa and Chāmuṇḍa of the Chapotkaṭa clan. An astrologer informed them that the child which the wife of Chāmuṇda was carrying when born would kill Chaṇḍa. So she was abandoned. She went to Panchāsara where she made her living by gathering fuel and other things. Ṣri Ṣılaguṇasūri who had gone out, saw the shade of Vaṇa tree bending over the boy who revealed auspicious marks. The mother was given shelter in a Chaitya or temple where he resided" (p. 12 Vanarājavṛttam). The name of the mother is not mentioned by the P. P. S. The P. C. makes no mention about the parentage of Vanarāja. Its account begins thus : " Gurjaradharitrī, i. e. Gurjarland was a part of Kānyakubja. In the village of Panchāsara in the district of Vadhra in that Gurjarland, a mother placing her boy in a cloth-swing under Vanatree was gathering fuel. Silaguṇasūri observed that the shade of the tree even though it was afternoon was bending over the child. Thinking that this was due

to the mysterious prowess of the boy who would become a Jainaṣāsanaprabhāvka i. e. a propagator of Jain faith, he took him from his mother who was provided with a living. He was entrusted to the care of Gaṇinī (i. e. the head-nun) Vīramatī. He was given the name of Vanarāja. When he was eight years old he was asked to look after the holy things so that they might not be damaged by rats. He did this by killing them with arrows. Ṣilaguṇasūri foresaw from his horoscope that he was to become a great king and so he was returned to his mother. Vanarāja lived with his maternal uncle who was leading the life of an outlaw against the ruling power.

The account of the Modhera Brāhmaṇas who claim to have given shelter to the queen and brought up her boy, gives her name as Chhattā or Akshatā.*

From all these accounts we find that Vanarāja was connected with Panchāsara in the earlier part of his life. Now let us see if we can discover some relation between the Chavadas of Aṇahillapura and those of Bhinnamāla through Panchāsara. According to the P. C. a king named Bhūyarāja was reigning in Kalyāṇakaṭaka which was the capital of Kānyakubja country, which contained thirty-six lacs of villages (p. 11). According to the same authority Gujrat was a territory of Kānyakubja country at the time of Vanaraja's birth. This is, however, an anachronism. For, we know that the

* The Prabhāvaka-charita gives the name of the monk as Devachandra. This is possible, for, Devachandra was a disciple of Ṣilaguṇasūri. See Pr. Ch. p. 265, and the introduction of Muni Kalyanvijayaji to the Gujarati translation of the same, p. 87.

Pratihāras who were reigning at Bhinnamāla in the middle of the eighth century A. D. became masters of Kānyakubja in the beginning of the ninth century A. D. when Nāgāvaloka II (see page C) defeated Chakrāyudha and became the ruler of Kānyakubja. According to the chronology of the P. C., however, Vanarāja died in the year V. S. 862 = A. D. 806 at the age of 110. This would mean that he was born in V. S. 752 = A. D. 696. Thus, at that time, Gujarat could not be a territory of Kānyakubja.

This anachronism may be explained by assuming that northern Gujarat was subject to the Pratihāras of Bhinnamāla who, later on, became emperors at Kānyakubja and so in later tradition Gujarat was regarded as a part of Kānyakubja.

Now, we saw that the Chāpas were displaced from Bhinnamāla by the Pratihāras. It is not certain, however, when this event took place. We saw that Vyāghramukha of Chāpa dynasty was reigning at Bhinnamāla in the Ṣaka year 550 = A. D. 628. When Yuan - Chang visited Bhinnamāla about the year 642 A. D. a young Kshatriya was reigning there. From the copper-plate of Pulakeṣi Avanijanāṣraya dated in the Kalachuri year 490= A. D. 739, we find that the Chāvoṭakas were afflicted by the Arabs, about that time. In the opinion of Pandita Gaurisamkara Oza, the Chāvoṭakas were attacked at Bhinnamāla (p. 146 Rajputaneka Itihasa). The B. G. regards them as the Chāvadās of Panchāsara (p. 149 - 50). The mention of Chāvoṭakas, in the grant, after Saindhavas Kachhhelas and Saurāshtras

would support the opinion of the B. G.; for Panchāsara is on the border of Kachchha, Kāthiawād, and Gujarāta. This would mean that the Chāvadās were rulers in northern Gujarat up to the year 739 A. D. and that for some reason, not known to us, they had changed their capital from Bhinnamāla to Panchāsara. After that time, they might have been deprived of their power by Pratihāras who must have given them a severe defeat at Panchāsara slaying their king in battle. This event must have driven the Chavadas to become outlaws against the Pratihāras who though, at that time were rulers at Bhinnamāla, became soon after emperors at Kānyakubja, and were, therefore, taken in later tradition, as the kings of Kānyakubja. The Chāvaḍas avenged themselves by robbing and killing the officers of the reigning king and when they had sufficient means founded a kingdom with Aṇahilavāda as its capital. If we accept the traditional date of V. S. 752=A. D. 696 for the birth of Vanarāja, his age would be about 43 years when this event might have taken place. According to the chronology of the P. C. he founded Aṇahila-vāda in the V. S. year 802=A. D. 746. But if we do not accept the rather unusually long age of 109 years given to him by the P. C. and suppose him to be born in the year V. S. 796 = 740 A. D. in a forest, he would be about 66 years old at the time of his death in the year V. S. 862 = A. D. 806. But even if we accept the traditional chronology, there is nothing unusual in supposing that after his father was slain in battle, say in the year 740. A. D. he might have lived as an outlaw against the new power for

about six years, and after avenging himself by robbing and killing the officers of the new power, he might have established an independent kingdom at Aṇahilavāda.

I must, however, confess that this supposition about the connection of Vanarāja Chāvada with the Chāpas of Bhinnamāla and of their defeat at Panchāsara at the hands of Pratihāras, though not improbable, is one, which requires more evidence to be accepted as an historical fact.

Whatever may be the antecedents of Vanarāja, all authorities agree on the point that he established the kingdom of Aṇahilavāda by founding a city on a site shown to him by one Aṇahilla - the son of Bhāruyāḍa Sākhada - that is Sākhaḍa the shepherd (P. C. p. 13).* From the play Moharājāparājaya of Yaṣahpāla, we learn, "Formerly the king Ṣrī Vanarāja observing the good features of the land founded a city on it" (Act III p. 67). In the same play Kumārapāla is addressed as one enjoying the kingship earned by Ṣrī Vanarāja (Act IV, p. 108). The story, (or as Abhayatilakagaṇī in his commentary on the Dvyāṣraya puts it 'loka-sruti', that is, the hearsay of the people) goes that as Vanarāja was looking for a place fit for the brave, he, on promising that the city would be named after the shepherd, was shown a piece of land where a powerful hound was being harassed by a fox

* According to the Vividha-tīrtha-kalpa of Jinaprabha there was formerly a town named Lakkhārāma (=Sk. Lakshārāma) on the bank of the river Sarasvatī. This town was the site on which Aṇahilavāda Pattana was founded. (......लकखारामे सरस्सई नईतडे। पुव्विं अणहिल्लवाडयपट्टणनिवेसट्ठाणं किर तं आसि। (p. 51. V. T. K.).

(The D. K. canto I, V. 4). The same story is repeated by the the P. C. and other works substituting a hare for the fox. *

The resources for establishing a kingdom Vanaraja obtained according to the P. C., by becoming nominally a spear-man of the Kānyakubja-power (according to our supposition of the Pratihāras of Bhinnamāla), and then waylaying and killing in a mountain - pass called Surāshtra the tax-collector as he was returning to the capital with six months' revenue from Gujarāta which amounted to twenty - four lacs of Pāruthakadrammas (probably Parthian gold coins) and four thousand horses of the Tejas breed.

The city was founded by building a dhavalagṛha (literally White house, i. e. a Royal Court or palace) under a Jāli tree. He was crowned king on Monday the second of the bright half of the month of Vaiṣākha in the year 802 after Ṣrī Vikramārka. The Tilaka ceremony (making an auspicious red - mark on the fore - head) was performed by his adopted sister Ṣrīdevī, the sister of a merchant of Kākara village. When Vanarāja was an outlaw, he went to the house of this merchant on a thieving expedition, but turned back from the place as his hand accidentally got wet in a pot of curds. This was equal to dining at the place and according to the ethics of the outlaws, he could not rob a house where he had dined. On the next day, he was called secretly at night by Ṣrīdevī who treated him with sisterly affection. He was treated to a dinner and given a dress. Vanarāja promised

* Similar stories are told about the founding of Ahmedabad and other cities.

her that she will perform the Tilaka ceremony which is a sister's privilege at the time of his coronation. He kept the promise.

He made one Jāmba, a merchant, his Mahāmātya, i. e. the principal minister. As the story goes, Vanarāja with his companions met him in a jungle when he was an outlaw. Jāmba had five arrows with him, but broke the two of them in their presence. When asked the reason, he said that three arrows were sufficient for the three of them. Vanarāja was naturally impressed with the man and tested his skill by asking him to shoot at a flying object which he did to his satisfaction.

How much historical reality there is in these stories, we cannot definitely say. Looking to the times and surroundings, they are not at all improbable.

The colophon at the end of the Nemināthachariu supplies us with more reliable information which is important as indicating the way in which Vanarāja tried to make his city prosperous and strengthen his kingdom.

It says "There is a family called Poruyāḍa (S. Prāgvāta) originally of the city of Sirimāla (S. Ṣrīmāla). The family is a treasure of excellent men (lit. Māṇikya – rubies – amongst men) of innumberable virtues." This family which owned elephants, horses, and a rich store of merchandise came to the town of Gambhuya (a place near Aṇahilapura Patana). In that family, there was a famous rich merchant–prince named Thakkura Ninnaya. On one occasion, the king, (i. e. Vanaraja) who looked upon him as a father (janayabuddhie) took him to his own Anahillapāḍa (-that is Ninnaya was requested to reside in his own

capital of Aṇahillapāṭaka). There, Ninnaya built a temple of Ṛshabha – the first Tīrthaṃkara of the Jainas.

This Ninnaya had a son named Lahara who was a general of the armies of Vanarāja. This Lahara went to the Vindhya Mountains and caught many elephants; he also defeated many kings 'with the intention of taking away their elephants.' He was a devotee of the goddess Vindhyavāsinī in whose honour he built a temple in a village called Sandathala. Lahara believed that it was the favour of this goddess who entered his bow (dhanush) which enabled him to conquer his enemies easily. The author of the Praṣasti tells us that the goddess is known there after the name of Lahara – Dhanuhāvī (because she was the presiding deity of his dhanush (i. e. bow). Lahara presented his elephants to Vanarāja who 'being satisfied with his work' rewarded him with the grant of the village Sandathala.

This geneologist of the Prāgvāṭa family tells us that Lahara was favoured both by the goddess Lacchi–Lakshmī and the goddess Sarasai – Sarasvatī – that is – he was favoured both by Fortune and Learning.

This account enables us to imagine as to how Vanarāja got the help of powerful and rich persons in strengthening his army and treasury.

We learn from the Prabandhachintāmaṇi that Vanarāja invited Ṣilaguṇasūri from Panchāsara and showed his gratitude by requesting him to occupy his throne and accept his whole kingdom which naturally the sage refused. At his suggestion, however, he built a chaitya – a temple – which was known as the Panchāsara chaitya in which the idol of Pārṣvanātha

- the twenty - third Tīrthamkara - brought from Panchāsara was consecreted. According to the Prabandhachintāmaṇi, the king placed his own statue in the pose of worship in this temple. The statue printed in the Rasmala is supposed to be this statue. Its authenticity, however, is doubtful. Arisimha also refers to this temple as if it were a mountain. Vanarāja built also another temple in honour of the goddess Kaṇṭeṣvarī or Kaṇṭheṣvarī known as Kaṇṭeṣvarī-prāsāda.

The Prabandhachintāmaṇi says that Vanarāja reigned for more than 59 years and lived for 109 years.

We have no information as to the extent of his dominions.

According to our three authorities on the Chāpotkaṭa dynasty, the Sukṛtasamkīrtana, the P. C. and the Vichāraṣreṇī, Vanarāja was succeeded by his son Yogarāja. In his reign, ships of a foreign king laden with rich cargo were driven by storm to Somanātha Pattana in Saurāshṭra. His son Kshemarāja requested the king to permit him to take possession of these foreign ships. There were ten thousand horses of the Tejas breed, eighteen elephants and crores of other things in the ships. " They will carry all these things to their country through our country. If your Majesty orders, the whole of it will be brought here." (P.C.p.14)

Yogarāja, however, forbade it. But Kshemarāja and his younger brother, thinking that the king had grown senile took passession of this foreign property as it was being carried through the boundary of their kingdom. This may be the boundary between Kathiawad and main - land Gujarata. When Yogarāja heard this news, he was deeply affected by this misdeed

of his sons; for he was trying to wipe off the bad name that attached to his dynasty as that of the Charatas or robbers. He fasted unto death for the sins of his sons. According to A and D mss of the P. C. Yogarāja ruled for more than ten years, while according to V. Sreṇī 9 years. In the other mss of the P. C. he is credited with a reign of 35 years and a life of 120 years. If we accept, however, the version of A. D. mss which agrees approximately with that of V. S. in different regnal years and in order of succession those of the S. S. and the V. S. we can deduct twenty-five years from 12o years of his life. That will give him a life of about 95 years.

He built a temple in honour of the goddess Bhaṭṭārikā Ṣrī Yogeṣvarī known as B. S. Y.-Prāsāda.

Following our three authorities which agree in the order of succession we find that there were in all eight kings of the Chāpotkaṭa dynasty and that their rule lasted for 190 years according to the P. C. and 196 years according to the V. S. Of these, the seventh king Āgada who is called Āhaḍa by the S. S., built two temples, one known as Āgadeṣvara-prāsāda probably dedicated to Ṣiva and the other known as Kanṭeṣvarī-prāsada dedicated to the goddess Kanteṣvari in whose honour, as we saw, Vanarāja had also built a temple.

The eighth king Bhūyagada who is called Ṣrī Bhūbhaṭa by the S. S. built a temple known as Bhuyagadeṣvara-prāsāda He, to protect the city, built also, a wall round the city of Aṇahilāvaḍa Pattana which is called here only Ṣrī Pattana.

According to the S. S. he was succeeded by his sister's son who belonged to the Chaulukya family.

From the cultural point of view, two things may be noted. One of them is Yogarāja's refusal to take possession of the foreign property and fasting unto death for the sins of his sons though he could kill them as none of them could bend the bow which he did easily. The other is the building of Devaprāsādas or palaces dedicated to gods. The wall round the city of Aṇahilavāda must have been a magnifiscent thing, because as we shall see later on, it had specially attracted the attention of the poets.

According to a verse quoted in the P. C. the kingdom of the Gurajars from the time of Vanarāja onward was made firm by Jain counsels. It is a question how much of this claim is historically valid. The official religion of the kings was, no doubt, Ṣaiva and Ṣākta. But the influential persons in the state, the rich Mahājanas, for example–men like Thakkura Ninnaya of the Prāgvāṭa family whom Vanaraja invited to live in Anahilavāda, were, probably, most of them Jainas. They occupied high posts in the state, – many of them were Mantris or Councillors and some of them like Vimalasāha were Dandanāyakas – commanders of army and then governors of districts. So from this point of view, the claim may be regarded as valid – at least partially. As, however, we shall see later on there was nothing characteristically Jaina as far as their political life was concerned. The rivalries of the priests of different sects, it appears, was always kept in check by the rulers of the state.

13

The total absence of contemporary inscriptional evidence of the Chāvaḍā period is somewhat relieved

in the Solanki period. Luckily a number of copper-plate-grants and some stone-inscriptions have been discovered which help us in piecing together the history of the period.

The literary material of the period is in greater abundance. In addition to the books mentioned for the Chāvaḍa period which also supply us with material for the Solanki period, we have the Samskṛta and the Prākṛta Dvyāśrayas of Hemachandra himself. The other name of the S. D. is Chaulukyavamśotikīrtana that is An Account of Chaulukya family and that of the P. D. is Kumārapāla charitam, that is the Life of Kumārpāla. Next to the contemporary inscriptions, these two epics of twenty cantos and eight cantos each respectively are our most reliable sources for the history of the period not only political but social also. The two commentaries on the two works, one that of Abhayatilakagaṇi and the other that of Pūrṇakalaśagaṇi elucidate many historical points. The Kīrtikaumudī of Someśvara Bhatta, the friend of the minister Vastupāla gives in the first two cantos, descriptions of Aṇahilavāda-Pattana and of the lake Sahasralinga and a short account of the Solankis or Chaulukyas. The Prabhvākacharita (V. S. 1334 = A. D. 1278) of Prabhāchandra in addition to the life of Hemachandra refers to some events of the Solanki period when narrating the lives of contemporary great men of the Jain sect. The other contemporary works will be noted at their proper places. For the chronology of the period our main sources are the P. C. and the V. S. The dates of the inscriptions and those of colophons supplement this chronology.

How the kingdom of Anahillavāda passed from the hands of Chāvaḍas to those of Solankis, remains, as yet, an obscure question. The Vadnagara inscription of Kumārapāla simply says that the Rājyakamalā (Royal power) of Chāpotkata kings became of her own accord his slave.' The Moharājaparājaya tells us that the family of Yādavas and the family of Vanarāja were destroyed through drinking (p. 109). Madyaṣekhara the personification of intoxicating drinks in the same play says " He was fondled for a long time in the royal palaces of Chāvukkaḍa (or Chāvaḍā) kings (p. 108). The Sukṛtasamkīrtana of Arisiṃha simply tells us that after Bhūbhaṭa, his sister's son Mūlarāja came to the throne. The D. K. is altogether silent on the point. The P. C. supplies the deficiency by giving the following account.

Three brothers named Rāja, Bīja and Dandaka, sons of Munjāla of the family of Sri Bhūyarāja of Kānykubja, while returning from their pilgrimage to Somanātha came to Aṇahillapura. Rāja managed to marry the sister of Sāmantasimha named Līlādevī. She died when she was in a state of pregnancy. An operation was performed upon her and the child brought out of the womb. As he was born under the influence of Mūla constellation, he was called Mūlarāja. When the boy grew up his maternal uncle Sāmantasimha under the influence of drink used to play with him by temporarily making a king of him. On one occasion, seeing his opportunity, Mūlarāja killed his maternal uncle and usurped the throne with the help of his party (P. C. p. 16). The bards also relate a similar story with a few variations.

From all these accounts, we can infer that Mūlarāja Solanki must have forcibly taken the kingdom of the Chavaḍas. It is highly probable that he might have been the sister's son of the last king as Arisimha relates. That drunkenness had something to do with it – was the belief of the people in the time of Kumārapāla.

In his copper-plate-grant dated V. S. 1043=A. D. 987 discovered from Kaḍi, Mūlarāja is called Chaulkikānvayo Mahārajādhirāja Ṣrī Mūlarājaḥ Mahārājādhirāja. Srī Rājisutaḥ. This means that he belonged to the Chaulkika dynasty and his father was Mahārājādhirāja Ṣrī Rāji. If this title of the father is not given to him on account of the greatness of the son we must conclude that Rāji was also a king. He is called Rājibhū – that is son of Raji in the D. K. (V. 92,30). In canto III v. 99 Hemachandra calls him the son of the brother of Daḍhakka ! This means that one of the brothers of Rāji was called Daḍhakka. Abhayatilakagaṇi in the commentary gives the names of the three brothers as Rāji, Bīja and Daḍhakka. In the D. K. itself I have not found the name of Bīja.

In Canto I v. 188 of the D. K. Mūlarāja is called Chanḍikāmāta. The commentator explains it as one whose mother was queen Chāndaladevī. * Līlādevī of the P. C. may be another name or a mistaken Samskritized rendering of the Prākṛta of Chāndaladevī.

According to the chronology of the P. C., Mūlarāja regined from V. S. 998 to V. S. 1053 (A. D. 942–997).

We have three copper-plate grants of Mularāja

* According to the alternative explanation Chaṇḍikā would refer to the goddess Gaurī.

and one that of Chāmuṇḍarāja issued by him as heir-apparent in the reign of Mūlarāja. The first is dated in V. S. 1030 - Bhādrapada sud 5. This grant is not yet published. The late Dr. H. H Dhruva, in his article, in the Vienna Oriental Journal (Vol. V, p. 300 - 1) gave information about this copper - plate. The grant refers to a piece of land of Palaḍiyagrāma in the Gambhūta viṣaya (district). The grantee is one Vacchakāchārya. The occasion is the bathing-ceremony after solar eclipse. The lekhaka or writer of this grant is one Kela and the Dūtaka is Mahāsāndhivigrahika Srī Jaya.

After this comes the copper - plate - grant of Chāmuṇḍarāja. This was recently discovered. A photograph of the copper-plate was sent by Diwan Bahadur K. H. Dhruva to Muni Jinavijayaji who has very kindly supplied me with its transcription in modern Devanāgari script. This copper-plate grant is important from many points of view. The first is its Samvat which is Guptasamvat 1033. Now this is not the real Gupta Samvat, but it shows that in later times, these Samvat names were used indifferently. Sometimes Vikrama samvat was called Gupta samvat as in this particular case. *

Another point of importance is that Mūlarāja married Ṣrī Mādhavī, the daughter of Chāhamāna king Bhoja and that Chāmuṇḍa Rāja was born of her.

The most important point in the information that this copper - plate supplies, is, however, about the geneology of Mūlarāja. The P. C., as we saw, gives

* It may be noted that in the opinion of some scholars Vikrama samvat and Gupta samvat are identical.

Munjāla as the name of Mūlarāja's father. The Kumārapāla-prabandha and the Ratnamālā name some of his ancestors as:--Bhūyaḍa - Karṇāditya - Chandrāditya - Somāditya - Bhuvanāditya and Rāji. The Kumārapālacharita of Jayasimhasūri, however, gives a different account. 'In the city of Madhūpaghna, there was formerly a king named Chulukya. The descendants of this king were known as Chālukyas. Among his descendants there was one Sahajarāma who had a cavalry-force of three lacs of horses, and who defeated the lord of Ṣakas on the battle-field. This Sahajarāma had a son named Daḍakka or Danḍakka who got a victory over the king of Pipāsā. This Daḍakka had a son named Kānchivyāla who had a son named Rāji who was the father of Mūlarāja.' Thus Kānchivyāla was the name of the grand-father of Mūlarāja. Whether this Kānchivyāla was the same person as Munjāla or a different person we do not know. It is possible to interpret the term Kānchivyāla as meaning the Vyāla of Kānchi — that is the mad-elephant, tiger or king of Kānchi. It is therefore likely that Kānchivyāla might have been an honorific title of Munjāla extolling some of his exploits. However that may be, the name of Kānchivyāla receives corroboration from the copper-plate under discussion. It says that Mūlarāja was in the line of Ṣrī Vyāla-Kānchi.

[१]लाघ्य: चौल्किकराजवंशतिलकश्रीव्यालकाञ्चिप्रभोः ।
सन्ताने त्रिदशेन्द्रतुल्यमहिमा श्रीमूलराजो नृपः ॥

It need not be said that Ṣrī Vyālā - Kānchi is the same as Ṣrī Kānchi - Vyāla.

Thus we come to know definitely that Srī Vyāla-Kānchi was an ancestor of Mūlarāja.

The question whether the Chālukyas of Gujerat came from the north or the south still remains unsettled. Madhūpaghna of the king Chulukya can be identified with Mathura, but it might as well indicate Madurā in the south. Pipāsā may be identified with Biasā. But Kānchi, however, tempts one to guess that the Chālukyas or Solankis of Gujarāta came from the south. *

The grant authorizes a field near the village Varuṇādiṣarmmakapura (modern Vadasania) to be given to a Jaina temple for incense, lights, and flowers. This is also significant as we shall see later on. The grant contains the signatures of five ṣrāvakas. It ends Ṣrī Chāmuṇḍarājasya mama matam. This style of signing is still prevalent in Gujarāta.

The third grant is dated V. S. 1043 Māgha Vadi 5 Sunday (A. D. 987). It begins, Rājāvali - pūrvam. This would mean that the previous royal line should be taken as understood. It may, however, indicate that Mūlarāja might not have liked any reference to the previous Chāvaḍa kings. It compares the king to Rājahamsa, Brahmā, Vishṇu, Ṣiva, Indra Kalpa-vṛksha, Meru, Ocean, Cloud and the Elephant of Indra. In the comparision of Rājahamsa by a pun upon the word Paksha which means a wing and a side we are made to understand that both the sides - paternal and maternal of the king were pure.

We have already referred to this copper - plate as giving the name of his father Mahārājādhirāja Rājī. The grant is issued from Ṣrīmad Aṇahilapāṭaka. It was given at the time of the bath in the waters of Prāchī

* See Jinavijyaji's learned presidential address to the historical section of the twelfth Gujarāti Sāhitya - parishad. pp. 9 - 11.

Sarasvatī at Ṣrīsthala after the solar eclipse and the worship of the god of Rudramahālaya the lord of the gods. A village named Kamboika in the Modhera Ardhāshṭama in the Sārasvata Maṇḍala is given to the temple of Ṣrī Mūlanāthadeva in Mandali in the district of Vardhi (or Vadh).

The writer of the grant is one Kanchana - a son of Kāyastha Jejja. It ends Srī Mūlarājasya. The grant was personally given by the king. The third copper-plate (which was published in the E. I. Vol. X) is dated V. S. 1051 Māgha sudi 15. Mūlarāja is called Parama-bhattāraka Mahārājādhirāja Ṣrī Mūlarāja Deva. The occasion is Lunar eclipse. A village named Varṇaka in the district of Satyapura is given to Ṣrī Dīrghā-chārya son of Durlabhāchārya, a learned Brāhmaṇa of Kānyakubja. The grant is written by Kāyastha Kanchana probably the same as the writer of the previous one. The Dūtaka is Mahattama Ṣrī Ṣivarāja. The grant ends as usual with the signature of the king.

Hemachandra has described at length two main events of the life of king Mūlarāja: one - his fight with Grāharipu of Vāmanasthalī and his powerful ally Laksha of Kachchha; the other-his fight against Dvārapa lord of Lāta. In the second fight, it was his son Chāmuṇḍa who led the army against Lāṭa.

The name of Ṣrī Mūlarāja is mentioned in the verse 135 of the first canto of the Dvyāsṛaya, the preceding 131 verses being devoted to the description of Aṇahilla-pura - which is given in graphic detail - not all conventional. He is called Chālukyakulachandramā - the moon of the family of Chālukyas.

It appears from verse 144 that Mūlarāja was of syāma, i. e. dark complexion as also was his grand-son Durlabha (v. 60 Canto VII). The family deity of the Chālukyas was Śrī Somanātha - that is god Śiva whose image was consecrated in a temple at Somanātha Pattana or Prabhāsa Pattana in Kāthiawād one of the most ancient holy places of pilgrimage of India known even to the Mahābhārata-as we have seen before. Any thing of importance that Mūlarāja did was supposed to be at the suggestion of the god Somanātha. So we find Hemachandra saying that it was at the suggestion of the god Śambhu who appeared to him in a dream that he undertook the expedition against Grāharipu. He consults Jambaka and Jehula, two of his main counsellors. According to Abhayatilakāgaṇi, Jambaka was his Mahāmantrin while Jehula - the Rāṇaka of Khairalu was his Mahāpradhāna. Jehula recounts the misdeeds of Grāharipu in detail - the main being his harassment of the pilgrims and the sacrilege of the holy places by killing and eating the sacred animals. His treatment of the defeated enemies is referred to as not worthy of a Kshatriya. In short he is described as an incarnation of the devil. So Jehula advises the king immediately to send a general without even sending an envoy for the formal declaration of hostilities.

Jambaka agrees with Jehula so far as subjugating Grāharipu is concerned. He describes the strongly fortified position of the enemy, as the mountain is only at a distance of Krosa while the sea is at a distance of Yojana from his capital. + He also refers to his constant watchfulness and his powerful ally

Laksha of Kachha, the son of Phulla and requests the king to proceed personally against these Ābhiras if he wants victory (verse 103 - 108 - 09). In an open meeting, the decision is taken to proceed against Grāharipu of Vāmanasthalī. Mūlarāja is glad that he has an occasion to fight.

The fight takes place on the river Jambu - māli which can be identified with the river Bhogāvo in Kāthiawada, on whose bank there is a place called Jambu near Limbdi. Some of the allies of Mūlarāja are the kings of Meru, Kāśi, Arbuda and many Bhilla tribes referred to as eighteen Bhūta jātis (C. IV 79).* For two days the battle continued indecisively. On

---

+ Abhayatilakagaṇi says that here 'krosa and yojana' are not to be taken literally but as merely suggesting very small distances, because 'the mountain is at a distance of seven Krosasas while the sea is at a distance of five yojans from Vāmanasthalī. If there was any other capital of Grāharipu at a distance of a Krosa from the mountain and a yojana from the sea, I do not know.' A very frank confession worthy of a historian !

* It appears that the author of the B. G. has not correctly understood some verses of the D. K. bearing on this context. It says ' Mūlarāja had also his own younger brother Gangāmaha etc. (p. 160). Now Mūlarāja had no brother of that name. The verse which appears to be the basis of this information is the second verse of Canto II of the D. K. It simply means Gangāmaha and his youger brother who, as the commentary says, were Mularājanrpau - that is two kings on the side of Mūlarāja - rose to fight. These two brothers were reigning in Gangāpura probably a place in Rajaputānā. Then again the B. G. says "It is specially mentioned that in this expedition Mūlarāja received no help from the sons of his paternal uncle Bīja and Dandaka" (p. 160). I have found no

the third day Mūlarāja personally went into the thick of the battle on his elephant with two quivers filled with missiles. Grāharipu in a frenzy of rage mounted the elephant of Mūlarāja. In the combat Mūlarāja succeeded in throwing Grāharipu down from his elephant. Mūlarāja then jumped from the elephant and tied Grāharipu with ropes and thus made a prisoner of him. (IV 100 - 103).

Then Laksha of Kachchha dressed in white rushed towards Mūlarāja and insulted him by abusing and calling him Mūla. In a deadly combat Mūlarāja pierced Laksha with his spear and killed him there and then.×

Queens of Grāharipu with their children come to Mūlarāja and request him to release their husband which Mūlarāja does. From there, Mūlarāja goes to Somanātha and worships the god Somanātha. According to the commentator, it was Ṣivarātri (V. 139) when he recited his prayers.

Mūlarāja returned to his capital with one hundred and eight elephants within five or six days.

The cause of war with Dvārapa of Lāṭa is given as the insult Dvārapa offered to Mūlarāja by sending

---

reference to the sons of Bīja and Dandaka in the Dvyāṣraya. Bīja is not even mentioned. The verse in which the name of Dadhakka occurs is 99 Canto III. It rather means 'who did not serve Daḍhakka's brother's son by following him?' The meaning is – everybody followed Mūlarāja who was the son of Raji brother of Daḍhakka.

× In spite of its uncouth grammatical language, it must be confessed, Hemachandra has described the fight with great vigour. In fact, we may remark in passing, that the Dvyāṣraya has considerable poetic merit of vigour and graphic description which is however hidden under its forbidding grammatical garb.

him as a present an ominous elephant. The matter was discussed and an expedition against Lāṭa was decided upon. Prince Chāmuṇḍa who had listened in the temple of Ṣiva to the heroic deeds of Arjuna described by Vyāsa (VI 6) was spoiling for a fight. So he was made the General of his army though Mūlarāja accompanied him (44). Ṣvabhravatī or the river Sābaramatī was the northern boundry of Lāṭa. As the army encamped on the river, people began to flock to Bharucha, the capital of Lāṭa. Prince Chāmuṇḍa defeated Lāṭa. The event is described by calling Chāmuṇḍa 'the hurricane which uprooted the tree in the form of the king of the southern bank' (VI 99).

The Sukṛtasamkīrtanana first describes the defeat of Bārapa whom he calls the Dandanātha general or governor of the king of Kānyakubja (II – 5) and then refers to the defeat of tne army of Laksha Kacchapa – that is Lord of Kachchha. The war with Grāharipu is referred to as a war with Laksha by all subsequent writers probably because he was killed in battle. The K. K. refers also to these two wars with Bārapa and the ambitious Kachchha king Laksha. It, however, calls Bārapa the general of the king of Lāṭa. The P. C. describes these events a bit differently. According to it Mūlarāja was simultaneously attacked on one side by the king of Sapādalaksha and on the other by Bārapa who is called the general of the king of Telangadeṣa. This fight with the king of Sapādalaksha is not referred to by Hemachandra, but we find the king of Maru as Mūlarāja's ally in his fight against Grāharipu.

The P. C. also without referring to Grāharipu

refers to Lākha or Laksha whose mother cursed Mūlarāja with a skin-disease called luti, because he touched the moustache of the dead hero lying on the battlefield with his foot.

From his copper-plate of V. S. 1051, and the information from literary sources discussed just now, we can form the following idea of Mūlarāja's dominions at the end of his reign. In the north, his sway extended as far as Satyapura or Sāchora in the Jodhapura state; in the west, it extended to Saurāshṭra and Kachcha and in the south up to the river Narmadā, and in the east probably as far as Godharā.

From his copper-plate of this V. S. 1043, we learn that Rūdramahālaya was already built at Ṣrīsthala on the river Sarasvatī, so also a temple of Siva known as Ṣrī Mūlanāthadeva was built in Mandalī (Māndala) for whose benefit the grant is given. The P. C. informs us that Mūlarāja first built two temples of Ṣiva in Ṣrīpattana, that is Anahillapura - one known as Ṣrī Mularājavasahikā and the other in honour of Ṣrī Munjāladeva - on the authority of the P. C. - his grand father - known as Ṣrī Munjāladevaprāsāda. Mūlarāja, being a great devotee of Somanātha, the P. C. tells us, used to go every Monday to Someṣvara - pattana. The god being greatly pleased with his devotion came to Mandalī, so Mularāja built there a temple known as Muleṣvara - prasāda to which, as we saw, the grant of V. S. 1043 (987 A. D.) is given. Being further pleased with his devotion, the god came to Aṇahillapura; and so Mūlarāja built another temple known as Tripurusha-prāsāda - probably to commemorate the three brothers Rāji, Daḍhakka and Bīja who are known to the

tradition as the three ādi-purushas i. e. original persons of the dynasty; or it might simply mean that it was a temple of the trinity of Ṣiva, Vishṇu and Brahmā.

The S. S. K. also refers to Mūlarāja's visiting Somanātha every Monday and to his building three Ṣambhu temples (II - 3, 4).

According to the D. K. Mūlarāja after consulting his ministers, Purohitas, and astrologers gave the throne to his son Chāmuṇda and himself retired to Ṣrīsthala that is Siddhapura on the Sarasvatī and ended his life by sacrificing his body in fire. The S. S. K. and the P. C. refer to similar incidents.

Here we may refer to the important persons of Mūlarāja's reign. Hemachandra mentions Jambaka, and Jehula the chief of Kheralu, as his principal ministers. The grant of V. S. 1051 (995 A. D.) describes the grantee Ṣrī Dīrghāchārya-son of Ṣrī Durlabhāchārya originally of Kānyakubja as' aṣeshavidyāpāraga ' that is ' master of all departments of learning ' and ' taponidhi ' (lit. ocean of austerities) that is a ' great ascetic.' The name of Mūlarāja's Mahāsāndhivigrahaka-great minister of peace and war-was Ṣrī Jaya who was the gift - causer of the grant of V. S. 1030 (974 A. D.).

From the colophon of the Nemināthachariu, we learn that in the Prāgvāṭa family of Ninnaya and Lahara was born one Vīra who was a minister in the reigns of Mūlarāja, Chāmuṇda, Vallabha and Durlabha. He was in charge of the Tankaṣālā that is the mint where he made coins in the image of Lakshmī.

From the Surathotsava of Someṣvara, we learn that Ṣrī Sola - ṣarman was the Purohita of Mūlarāja. He performed the great sacrifice known as Vājapeya.

The great ascetic Kanthaḍi and his disciple Vayajalladeva, whose account is narrated by the P. C., may also be mentioned as two opposite types of Yogis who represent peculiar religious attitudes which have affected the religious consciousness of Gujarāta. Kanthaḍi, when requested by Mūlarāja, refused to become the head of the Royal Temple of the Tripurusha - prāsāda and preferred to remain a recluse; while his disciple Vayajalladeva consented to take charge of the temple if he would be provided with means to enjoy life in a royal style whlch included thirty-two beautiful women to sing and dance before him. The queen of Mūlarāja thought that a man living such a life could not be chaste and so tested his character by trying to ensnare him with her feminine charms. But Vayajalladeva proved superior to these attractions and punished the queen for her frivolity.

This story may be real or may be purely a myth but it does represent a peculiar type of men which existed in those days and which in its weaker instances has proved to be the bane of religious institutions of India. ×

According to the chronology of the P. C., Śrī Chāmuṇḍarāja reigned for thirteen years from V. S. 1053 - to 1066 = A. D. 997 to 1010. We have already referred to his copper - plate - grant of the pseudo - Gupta Samvat 1033 (= A. D. 977) which sanctioned a field to be given to a Jaina temple. His conquest of Lāṭa we have also mentioned.

× Compare the story of Nannasūri teaching the KāmaŚāstra of Vātsyāyana in his Chaitya in the Prabhāvakacharita (pp. 161 - 163).

No important event of his reign is described by the Dvyāṣraya. The Vadanagara - praṣasti of Kumārapāla informs us that he defeated Sindhurāja whom we cannot exactly identify. He may probably be Vārapa of Lāṭadeṣa – the word Vārapa literally meaning 'lord of waters'. According to the D. K. he had three sons: Vallabharāja, Durlabharāja and Nāgarāja. When referring to their education, Hemachandra mentions their training and proficiency in managing horses and elephants.

About the birth of these princes the Prabhāvaka-charita gives some significant information. Chāmuṇḍarāja was very much troubled by the fact that his queens always suffered from mis-carriage. He once mentioned this anxiety of his mind to his minister Vīra. (This Vīra was the same as mentioned by the N. C. Colophon). Vīra consulted his religious preceptor Srī Vīrasūri. He gave him some charmed fragrant powder and directed that the queens should sprinkle themselves with it. After this treatment 'Ṣrīmad Vallabharāja and other sons were born' (The Pr. C. verses 135-148 pp. 213-14). According to the same book, Chāmuṇḍarāja had met previously Ṣrī Vīrasūri whose sermons he had heard and of whose miraculous power he was aware. This incident together with his grant to a Jaina temple may be taken as signifying some Jaina influence on the king.

The Dvyāṣraya tells us that the prince Vallabharāja with the permission of the king Chāmuṇḍarāja led an expedition against Mālavā, but on the way he was attacked with an incurable disease (which according to the commentatory was small-pox) and died of it. The generals very tactfully retreated the army

and came back to Aṇahillapura. The king was deeply touched with this sad incident and retired to the holy place of Ṣuklatīrtha on the bank of the Narmadā, after giving the crown to his second son Durlabharāja. (C. VII verses 1 – 58 .

The commentator Abhayatilakāgaṇi while commenting on the verse 31 of the C. VII narrates a different tale. Chāmuṇḍarāja became sexually very loose, so his sister Vāchiṇīdevī managed to remove him from the throne and give it to Vallabharāja. Chāmuṇḍarāja, smarting under this disgrace, proceeded to Benares, but was attacked in Mālavā and robbed of his umbrella and other royal insignia. He returned to Aṇahillapura and asked his son Vallabha to march against Mālavā. The commentator says "As such an incident would not be worthy of the person described, the incident is merely suggested by saying that 'he took the permission of his father' (p. 531). There may be some grain of reality in this story and if we read it in connection with the fact that his queens always mis-carried we are tempted to guess that Chāmuṇḍa may have suffered from some foul sexual disease.

The P. C., however, refers this incident of being robbed of royal insignia to Durlabharāja. It was Munja of Mālava who perpetrated this insult. Merutunga says "From that time onward hereditary enmity was formed between kings of Mālava and Gujarāta. According to the A.ms of the P. C. Ṣrī Chāmunḍa–rāja built two temples presumably of Ṣiva., one known as Chandanātha–devaprāsāda and the other Chāchiṇeṣvara–devaprāsāda (p. 20). The second may very well be Vāchiṇeṣvara, (Va and Cha being written similarly in Devanāgarī).

In that case that temple would be in commemoration of his sister. Chanda also may be some relative.

Vallabharāja is mentioned after Chāmuṇḍa in the dynastic list, and is given a reign of six months. He earned two titles Rājamadanaśaṃkara and Jagajjhampana or °kampana-meanıng 'world-shaker.'

According to the D. K., however, Chāmuṇḍa was succeeded by his second son Durlabha, who according to the P. C. ruled for eleven years-from V. S. 1066 to 1077=A. D. 1010 - 1021. He was invited, narrates the D. K., to the Svayamvara of his sister Durlabhadevī by Mahendra - king of Maru. He went there with his younger brother Nāgarāja. He was chosen by the princess whom he married. Nāgarāja was married to the younger sister of Durlabhadevī named Lakshmī. A battle with the disappointed kings is also narrated (C. VII verses 66 - 142).

Durlabha is suggested to be of dark complexion in v. 60 of the same canto. In verse 64, there is a faint suggestion of Jaina influence-when Hemachandra says that Durlabha gave up Ekānta i. e. one-sidedness of out-look. According to the commentary of Abhaya-tiilakagaṇi, Durlabha built Jain temples (v. 63) and came under the influence of one Jineśvarasūri (v.-64). *

According to the P. C. he built a lake, named after him, Durlabhasara., and according to the A.ms of the P. C. he built, in addition, in Srīpattana a royal palace of seven floors with a building for treasury and for Ghaṭikā to keep time, and a stable for elephants. He also built a temple known as Śrī Madana-śaṃkara

* See also the Prabhāvakacharita p. 264.

prāsāda for the spiritual benefit of his brother Vallabharāja.

From the Surathotsava of Somesvara, we learn that Lallasarman son of Solasarman was the Purohita of Chāmuṇḍa and his son Srī Munja–the Purohita of Durlabharāja.

The Dvyāsraya says 'Nāgarāja the younger brother had a son named Bhīma, and both Nāgarāja and Durlabha thought that they were discharged from 'parental debt' of producing a son (Pitruṇa).' This means that Durlabha had no issue and adopted Bhīma as his heir. Bhīma was brought up in the laps of Durlabha. The education of Bhīma is also described. He became a master of gymnastics.

Durlabha asked Bhīma to accept the throne which, however, he first refused. He requested that his father Nāgarāja should be made king. On both of them, however, pressing him, he mounted the throne. Both Durlabha and Nāga dedicated themselves to religious life and died soon after.

The P. C. gives Bhīma 42 or 43 years' reign from V. S. 1077 – 78 to V. S. 1120 = A. D. 1021 – 1064. Three copper–plate–grants of his reign have been discovered – dated V. S. 1086 Kārtikka sudi 15 (A. D. 1029 – 30), Vaisākha sudi 15 of the same year (A. D. 1030), and Samvat 93 Chaitra Sudi 11, that is V. S. 1093=A. D. 1037. The first which is issued from Aṇahillapāṭaka gives a village called Masuragrāma in Ghadahaḍikādvādasa in the province of Kachchha. The grantee is one Bhattārka Ajāpāla – son of Āchārya Mangalasiva – originally of Navanikaka in the province of Kachchha.

The writer of the grant is Vaṭeśvara - son of Kāyachcha (°stha). The Dūtaka is Śrī Chaṇḍaśarmmā the great minister of peace and war.

The second is also issued from the capital, the writer and the Dūtaka being the same as the last one. The grant gives a field near Muṇḍakagrāma in Vardhivishaya (in the Vadhiar district) to one Vāsudeva son of Balabhadra - Udicha Brāhamaṇa - a Brahamaṇa from the north.

The third is dated Samvat 93. It may be that the figures to indicate thousand may have been left out or intentionally kept understood. The year intended is V. S. 1093. The writer and the Dūtaka of this grant are the same as those of the previous two. It is issued from Aṇahilapāṭaka and grants a field in the limits of a village called Sahasachānāgrāma in Kachchha. The grantee is one Govinda - son of Damodara of Vatsa-gotra originally of Prasannapura -sthāna. *

These grants indicate that Vaḍhiara and Cutch continued to remain within the jurisdiction of Aṇahilapāṭaka in the reign of Bhīma. I.

The Dvyāśraya mentions the two main political events of his reign as the defeat and imprisonment of Hammuka - the ruler of Sindha and the acceptance of a freindly alliance by Karṇa - the king of Chedi whose other name is given as Kalachuri (v. 28, C. IX).

Two of his secret emmissaries, after their tour, come to Bhīma and inform him that the king of

* It is likely that the Brāhmaṇas reffered to in this grant are Praśnora nāgars of Gujarata amongst whom Vatsagotra is common. Probably the word Praśnorā has something to do with Prasannapura.

Sindha is planning to murder him; and that the ruler of Chedi is also becoming unfriendly. Bhīma after consulting his ministers first marches against Sindha. In verses 74-84 C. VIII. Hemachandra gives a graphic and vigorous description of the Sindhuvaha or ' flow of the Indus', and tells that the king of Sindha 'enjoys a quiet sleep', being protected by this watery barrier. Then the heroic effort of building a bandha, (a sort of a bund) is described poetically in verses 90 - 106 of the same canto. The army of Bhīma crosses the Indus and a royal battle ensues. Hammuka is defeated and imprisoned (124), and the horses of Bhīma graze on the grounds of Hammuka and his sugar-canes become the fodder of his elephants (125).

From Sindha, the conquering army marches towards Chedi. An envoy of Bhīma, whose name is given as Dāmodara by Hemachandra and who appears to be the same as the Mahāsāndhivigrahika Ḍāmara vipra of the P. C., approaches Karṇa-the king of Chedi, chewing beetle-leaf wifh camphor etc. in a lordly style and asks him on behalf of Bhīma whether he is a friend or a foe. Karṇa of Chedi chooses to be a friend and sends many presents to Bhīma including a suvarṇa-maṇdapikā of Bhoja the famous king of Mālavā, which according to the commentary, Karṇa had won from Bhoja.

Bhīma returns to the capital welcomed by the ladies of the city. A son is born to him who was named Kshemarāja and was known as 'dhārmika' or religious amongst the people. He got another son named Karṇa.

Another important event of Bhīma's reign which

is not mentioned in the Dvyāṣraya or the P. C. may be narrated here. It is the sack of Somanātha which has been described at length by modern historians (see C. H. I. Vol. III pp. 23 - 26). It was believed that this event is nowhere mentioned or even suggested in Hindu accounts. This is, however, not correct. The event is referred to in an Apabhraṃsa poem of Dhanapāla and the V. T. K. of Jinaprabha. Muni Ṣrī Jinvijayaji–that great savant and researcher of the history of Gujarat–edited and published for the first time in his J. S. S. (Vol. III pp. 241 - 43) that poem in the Apabhramṣa language and in the Utsāha metre of the poet Dhanapāla–the author of the Tilakamanjarī. Dhanapāla was a court - poet of the famous king Bhoja of Dhārā a contemporary of Bhīma I. In this poem reference is made to the looting by the Turks, of Ṣrīmāla country, Aṇahilavāḍa, Chandrāvatī, Soraṭha, Devalavāḍa and 'Someṡvara pleasing to the mind of the people'. Thus this is an almost contemporaneous account. The V. T. K. refers in the Satyapūrakalpa to the looting of Gurjara country by Gajjanavi, that is the lord of Gajani in the V. S. 1081 = A. D. 1025 (p. 29). Both these references apply to the expedition of Mahamud Gajani.

It is, however, strange to find that no mention of the sacking of Somanātha is found in the Ta'rikh - i - Lamini of Al - 'Utbi who was a sort of Private Secretary to Mohmud. He wrote a good account of Mohumd's biography, and is definitely known to have lived four years after this event. Rasinuddin and Hamidulla who came after more than two hundred years and have written accounts of Mohmud also make no

mention of this account. The first Muslim historian to mention this event is Ibu Asir (about 1230 A. D.). From this absence of reference amongst early Muslim historians, we are driven to the conclusion that this expedition against Somanātha must not have been an event of that importance which it is reported to be by the later Muslim chroniclers upon whom the modern historians have almost uncritically relied. It might have been just the ordinary looting of a marauding army as the places came on its way. *

The K. K. and the S. S. K. mention the defeat of Bhoja at the hands of Bhīma which the D. K. does not directly mention. The Purātanaprabandha-samgraha and the P. C. describe incidents which refer to constant warfare between Mālava and Gujarāta – relieved by a few intervals of peace. An effort made by Bhoja to break the peace-treaty (Sandhidūshaṇa) is mentioned in the P. P. S. and the P. C. They also refer to an attack on Aṇahillapura by a general of Bhoja named Kulachandra or Phula° who was a Digambara Jaina. This event happened, according to the P. C., when Bhīma was engaged in his expedition against Sindha. This has made the 'stealing by Kulachandra' proverbial (p. 32. The P. C.). On another occasion Bhīma had to send his Minister of War and Peace Ḍāmara to avert a proposed expedition against Gujarata by Bhoja as there was famine. Ḍāmara managed this business very cleverly by instigating Bhoja to march against the southern king Tailapa who had beheaded his uncle Munja, and by spreading a rumour, as he was

* For a further discussion of this topic, see Jinavijaya's article Mahmud Gaznavi and Somanātha" in the J. S. S. Vol. III pp. 252–257.

about to march that Bhīma was attacking Mālava and thus compelling Bhoja to sue for peace with a present to Bhīma of an elephant and his female. The P. C., lastly, mentions an attack by Karṇa of Chedi on Mālava when Bhīma assisted Karṇa as an ally. After Karṇa won in the battle, he refused to share the gains with Bhīma, so the latter sent Ḍāmara against Chedi who managed to get a share in the spoils from Karṇa. This is the same incident which Hemachandra describes in the D. K. and which enables us to identify Ḍāmara of the Prabandhas with Dāmodara of the D. K.

The P. P. S. and the P. C. relate many incidents which reveal a state of political and cultural rivalry between Gujarat and Mālava. Many of the stories in the P. C. turn round the uncommon wit and intelligence of the Brahmaṇa Minister for War and Peace–Ḍāmara or Dāmodara. He seems to be the Birbala of the P. C. ×

We are able to gather from the Prabhāvakacharita that already in the time of BhimaI Anahillapura has developped into a great centre of intellectual activity. The Prabhāvakacharita being devoted to the great men of Jaina religion naturally gives prominence to the learned men of that religion. But from the background it provides, we gather that poets and dialecticians of different sects from different parts of India visit the capital of Gurajaradeṣa. And even in the case of the learned men of the Jaina sect, their

× The uncommon wit and wisdom of Ḍāmara seems to have become almost proverbial in Gujarat; for we have still the habit of saying in the Gujarati language: डाह्यो डमरो थजे– 'Be a wise Ḍamaro !' For the famous well of Dāmodara see further on.

greatness is shown more by their proficiency in logic and the art of dialectics (Pramāṇaṣāstra), mastery of all the schools of philosophy (darṣanas), their thorough grounding in grammar and the science of language (ṣabdaṣāstra), and their cleverness in poetic compositions. Anybody familiar with Samskṛta Learning knows that these–Logic and Grammar, Philosophy and Literature are some of the main subjects that formed the common field of intellectual activity in India. And again as in the case of Ṣāntyāchārya and Surāchārya they often went to other kingdoms to fight the intellectual battle on behalf of their country.

The intellectual rivarly between Dhārā and Anahillapura was keen, and Bhoja and Bhima I always were jealous of the intellectual status of their courts. Bhoja in order to test the intelligence of Gurjaradeṣa (Gurjardeṣavijṇatā) so that he might see his opportunity for breaking the peace – treaty (sandhidūshanotpattaye) sends a gāthā – a stanza in Prākṛta with his sandhivigrahika to Bhīma. The gāthā means that 'a lion whose prowess is seen in the ease with which he kills a powerful elephant does not care to make war or keep peace with a deer.'* The suggestion is clear. The several answers proposed by his court-poets do not satisfy Bhīma who is ill at ease to find a thrashing rejoinder. His courtiers go out and find one Govindāchārya who was attending a dance–performance in a Jaina temple with his pupil Sūrāchārya. The Prabhāvakacharita gives a graphic description of the dance and tells us that when the

* हेलानिद्दलियगइन्दकुम्भपयडियपयावपसरस्स ।
सीहस्स मएण समं न विग्गहो नेव सन्धाणं ॥ The P. C. p. 28.

damsel perspiring reposed on a stone-pillar Govindāchārya was requested to describe that graceful pose. He looks at Surāchārya who composes a beautiful verse on the reposing damsel. + The courtiers, being impressed, request Govindāchārya to attend the court which he does with his pupil Surāchārya. He is requested to prepare a befitting reply and again he looks at his pupil. Surāchārya prepares the answer in a Prākṛta gāthā. It means : The creator in Bhīma, created the destroyer of the sons of the blind one; what does one matter to him to whom a hundred did not matter ? × Here there is a pun upon the word Bhīma and Andhakasuta. Bhima the Pāṇḍava killed the hundred sons of the blind Dhṛtarāshṭra; so this Bhīma will easily kill one son of the blind. This gāthā confirms the tradition that Sindhula the father of Bhoja was deprived of his eye-sight by his brother Munja.

This Surāchārya was a cousin of the king Bhīma, being the son of his maternal uncle Sangrāmasimha. If the mother of Bhīma was Lakshmī, younger sister of Mahendra who was the king of Marudeṣa, we may infer that Sangrāmasimha was a prince of Marudeṣa. Sangrāmsaimha died when his son was very young. His name, before he became a Jaina monk was Mahīpāla. His mother handed him ever for education to a brother of her husband who had become a Jaina monk known as Droṇāchārya. This Droṇāchārya was

+ See the Pra. Ch. p. 246. vs. 20-25.

यत्कङ्कणाभरणकोमलबाहुवल्लिसङ्गात् कुरङ्गकदृशो नवयौवनायाः ।
न स्विद्यसि प्रचलसि प्रविकम्पसे त्वं तत्सत्यमेव दृषदा ननु निर्मितोऽसि ॥२६॥

× अन्धयसुयाण कालो भीमो पुहवीइ निम्मिओ विहिणा ।
जेण सयंपि न गणिअं का गणणा तुज्झ इक्कस्स ॥ The P C. p. 28.

probably a disciple of Govindāchārya who is referred to as a man of versatile learning. Mahīpāla became a master of Vyākaraṇa, Nyāya, and Dharmaṣāstra. After finishing his education, he became a Jaina monk and and became famous as Sūrāchārya.

As a young man this Sūrāchārya was a terrific task - master of his pupils who once complained about his harshness to the elder Guru. The elder Guru rebuked him for his impetuous nature and asked him to show the power of his intellect by conquering the learned assembly of Bhoja. The young dialectician understood the taunt and expressed his determination to proceed to Dhārā which he afterwards did with the permission of his Guru, and his maternal cousin king Bhīma, who sent him there as his representative. His intellectual feats are decribed at length in the Prābhāvakacharita. +

A royal Purohita in ancient India was a persona grata. In the reign of Bhīma I this position was occupied by one Someṣvara. This gentleman appears to be a man of very liberal outlook. It was through his intercession that Jaina monks known as Suvihita or Vasativadins got a footing in Aṇahillapura, which was a stronghold of the Chaitya-vasin Jaina monks from the time of Vanarāja who was brought up, as we saw, by the Chaityavāsin monk Ṣilaguṇasūri. The Suvihitas or the Vasativādins practised more rigorously the discipline of Mahāvīra while the Chaityavasins were like the abbots or the heads of Maṭhas of other Hindu sects who led a life of ease and luxury. Artistic culture as well as harsher intellectual disciplines were fostered

+ See pp. 245-261.

by them. But they were not remarkable for their ascetic life, while the Suvihitas were. But the convention was that Suvihitas could not live in Aṇahillapura.

Jineṣvara and Buddhisāgara two munis or monks of Suvihita type come to Aṇahillapura. They were Brāhmaṇas of Madhyadeśa learned in the fourteen Vidyās as well as Smṛtis and Itihāsa and bore the names Ṣrīdhara and Srīpati before they were converted. When they found no place in the capital, they went to the Purohita and recited the Vedas and showed their mastery of Brahamaṇical learning. They were welcomed by Someṣvara to whom they showed the similarity of Veda-Upanishad - philosophy with Jaina philosophy. It was the emphasis on dayā or non-violence towards animals in Jaina religion which made them accept that faith. Someśvara provided them with lodging and boarding and when the men of Chaityavāsis asked these monks to leave Aṇahillapura the matter was brought before the king whose name the Prabhāvaka-charita gives as Durlabha * The Chaityavāsis argued their monopoly of residence on historical grounds. The king accepted their plea but requested them to allow these people to live in the capital as he could not refuse residence to respectable people.

Someṣvara then requested the king to provide for them a place of residence.

Jṇānadeva the pontiff of the Ṣaiva church came at that time to visit the king. He was informed of the incident. He was very much pleased to see that his

* See the Pra Ch. pp. 264-267. This incident may have taken place at the end of Durlabha's reign or more probably in the beginning of Bhīma's reign.

preachings had the desired effect on the king in as much as he honoured 'all holy men.' "Ṣiva is Jina" says Jṇānadeva "Let the Purohita give them land belonging to the Tripurusha (the Ṣaiva temple built by Mūlarāja) in the Rice-market. I will see to it that no trouble arises either from our side or the other side (p. 266)." Someśvara followed his instructions and got a residence for the Jaina ascetics. 'After that' says the Pr. Ch. "a series of residences sprung up; for that which is founded by great men prospers; there is no doubt in that" (p. 266.).

This incident explains the mental attitude of the religious leaders of the higher type as also how vested interests were responsible for quarrels within the sect itself.

Buddhisāgara composed a Samskṛta grammar which is named after him and consists of eight thousand ṣlokas – (that is units of eight syllables) according to the Pr. Ch.. According to the praśasti of the ms of this work, which is not yet published, the volume of the grammar was 7000 ślokas. It was composed at Jābālipura (Jalor) in the year V. S. 1180=A. D. 1124. Jineṣvara wrote a work on Logic. +

Another important figure of the times is the learned poet Dharma of Ṣri Bhṛgukachchha (Broach) on the banks of the river Mekala–Kanyā (Narmadā) in Lāṭa. His account is given at some length in the Prabhāvakacharita in connection with the poet Dhanapāla of Dhārā and the great logician of Aṇahillapura – Ṣantyāchārya.* His father Sūradeva was a very learned

+ See Purātattva Vol. II pp. 83–84.

* See the Pra. Cha. pp. 238–242.

man-'Brahman incarnate'. His mother Sāvitrī was the crest-jewel of the Satīs, and was famous for her charities. The family belonged to the Kaula sect of Ṣaivism and so Dharma is often referred to as the Kaula Kavi Dharma. Dharma had an elder brother named Ṣarma and a sister named Gomatī. As a child he was a great dunce; so his father had asked him to find out some employment for himself. He became a guardsman in some sugar-cane field on the other side of the Narmadā, and while serving there, through the favour of some Yoginī, his intellectual powers suddenly developed. As he approached the bank of the river to cross it, he burst into a poem describing its powerful flow.* He crossed the river in a boat and went home. But he was not welcomed by his father and so left his home in disgust abusing his Kaula sect in choicest terms. He toured all the provinces holding debates with the learned men and defeating them. He came to Dhārā and sent his challenge to the king Bhoja. There he describes himself as having defeated Ṣambhu of Gauḍa (Bengal), Dvija in Dhārā, Vishṇu in Bhattia - Mandala and Paṣupati in Ṣrī Kānyakubja. His challenge is that let any body face him in the sciences of Tarka, Lakshaṇa and Sāhitya. He easily defeats all the learned men of Bhoja's assembly. Bhoja sends for his friend the poet Dhanapāla who had left him as he was insulted in connection with

* एते मेकलकन्यकाप्रणयिनः पातालमूलस्पृशः
संत्रासं जनयन्ति विन्ध्यभिदुरा वारां प्रवाहाः पुरः ।
हेलोद्वर्तितनर्तितप्रतिहतव्यावर्तितप्रेरित-
त्यक्तस्वीकृतनिह्नुतप्रकटितप्रोद्धृततीरद्रुमाः ॥ २४३ ॥
Pra. Ch. p. 239.

his novel Tilakamanjarī, and appeals to his patriotism by saying "Shall a foreigner–a Kaula–defeat Dhārā ?" Dhanapāla returns from Satyapura (Sachor in Rajputana) and defeats Dharma who accepts his superiority by saying that there is no body who is Dhanapāla's equal. Dhanapāla asks him to visit Ṣāntisūri of Anahillapura. Dharma at his sugggestion starts for Gurjaradeṣa (Pr. Ch. pp. 238–244). He comes to Aṇahillapura and meets the great logician Ṣāntisūri in an open debate. The arguments that Dharma puts forth were taken from the Tattvopaplava * a dialectical work showing that nothing is provable and nothing is knowable. (The author of this work is one Jayarāshibhaṭṭa.) Ṣrī Ṣāntyāchārya answers all his arguments and Dharma accepts him as his superior, and as a wonderful logician. He says " A man like Dhanapāla would not tell a lie. You are really a learned man" (Ibid. pp. 221–222).

This Ṣāntisūri appears to be a great figure in the intellectual and literary world of Gurjaradeṣa and Mālava. The Prabhāvakacharita devotes a whole chapter to this dialectician and poet (It may be remarked here, in passing, that in the culture of ancient India, Logic and Poetry were not divorced from each other). According to it he was born in a village known as 'Unattāyu' to the west of Ṣri Pattana, the present day Una near Radhanpura. His father was a rich man of the Ṣrimāla family and bore the name of Dhanadeva. His mother's name was Dhanaṣrī. He was known as Bhīma. Vijayasimha, seeing his

* A Palm-leaf ms of this work was first discovered by Pandita Sukhalalji and Pandita Bechardas from a Bhandar at Patana. An edition of this work by Pt. Sukhlalji and the present writer is under preparation.

uncommon intelligence begged him of his father. He was taught all the Kalās (arts) and Vidyās (sciences). From the learned assembly of Bhīma, he got the titles "Kavīndra" (A king of poets) and Vādichakrin (A king of dialecticians). Dhanapāla-the famous man of letters of Dhārā-got his Tilakamanjarī critically examined by Ṣāntyāchārya at the suggestion of his Guru Mahendra-ṣūri. Dhanapāla personally went to Anahillapura to make the request. He was astonished to see the high level of intelligence of a pupil of Santisūri whom he wanted to take to Dhārā. Ṣantisūri replied : " He has yet to study the difficult Pramāṇaśāstras. He should not be taken away from his studies ". At the request of Dhanapāla and with the permission of Bhīma, Ṣantisūri went to Dhārā as a representative of Gurjaradeṣa. He was very well received by Bhoja. There he critically went through the Tilakamanjarī - kathā and wrote a Ṭippaṇa on the work which exists in a manuscript form.

Bhoja in order to see the intellectual powers of this Ṣvetabhikshu of Gurjaradeṣa offered him a lac of rupees for every Vādin (dialectician) that he defeated. Ṣāntisūri defeated eighty-four of them and got the title Vādivetāla from Bhoja in addition to the promised sum of money which he spent in building temples. Ṣāntisūri was a Chaityavāsin.

Abhayadevasūri-the author of that big commentary on the Sanmatitarka of Siddhasena Divākara known as Vādamahārṇava was Ṣāntisūri's teacher. *

This Ṣāntisūri had thirty-two students studying pramāṇaṣāstra under him. It appears that Buddhist logic was also taught there and regarded as very difficult

* See further on.

to grasp.+ A young Jaina monk of the ascetic type named Muni Chandra attended his lectures standing unknown for a fortnight. When Ṣāntisūri put certain questions to his students, nobody could answer them. Chandrasūri with his permission answered them to his satisfaction, and then narrated his state of affairs. Ṣāntisūri was very much impressed with him and offered to teach him, at the same time providing him with a residence behind the Mint (Tankaṣālā), as he being a Suvihita monk had great difficulty to find one. So it appears it took some time, even after the royal permit, before these monks could find an easy footing in Aṇahillapura.

Ṣāntisūri, after his debate with Dharma, met a dialectician–come to Aṇahillapura from Drāviḍa country, whose name is not given but who is represented as talking in a strange language. He was also worsted.

Ṣāntisūri composed a commentary on the Uttarādhyayanasūtra with whose help Vādi Devasūri a disciple of Mūni Chandra defeated the Digambara dialectician Kumudachandra in the time of Jayasimha. It appears Ṣāntisūri was responsible for starting a school of logic amongst the Jainas; for we find this Vādi Devasūri composing a big work on the subject known as Pramāṇanayatattvāloka and its commentary Syādvāda – Ratnākara.

Ṣāntisūri died in the year V. S. 1096 = A. D. 1040.

We find from the copper–plates of Bhīma that his Mahā Sāndhivigrahika (Great Minister of War and Peace) was Ṣrī Chanḍaṣarman. To his minister Dāmodara orḌāmara we have already alluded. From

+ प्रमेया दुष्परिच्छेद्या बौद्धतर्कसमुद्भवाः । ७३ Pr. Ch. p. 220.

the Surathotsava, we learn that Bhīma's Purohita was Soma (vs. 15 – 16) who seems to be identical with the Someṣvara mentioned by the Prabhāvakacharita and to whom we have already referred.

From the N. N. C. Praṣasti we learn that Vīra–the Minister of Durlabharāja, who is also mentioned as we saw by the Pr. Ch., had two sons named Neḍhu and Vimala. Neḍhu was a minister of Bhīma while Vimala was a general of Bhīma. Vimala was sent to bring the ruler of Ābu under subjection which he did. He was, then, made the governor of the place. This Vimala, like his fore–fathers, was a worshipper of Ṣakti under the name of Ambā. After having made friends with the former ruler of Ābu, he built there the famous marble temple–a wonder of the world in sculpture and carving. The temple is known after him as Vimalavasahi. We learn from the Purātanaprabandhasamgraha that Neḍha became a monk and Vimala was made a king by Ṣrī Bhīma who, as insignia of honour, gave him an elephant and an umbrella (p. 52). It appears that the construction of the whole temple was not finished in Vimala's life–time; for the ranga – maṇḍapa, according to the P. P. S. was made by his son Chāhila (p. 152). According to the N. N. C. P., however, it was constructed by his grandson Pṛthvīpāla in the reign of Kumārapāla.

From the P. C. we learn that Bhīma had a son named Mūlarāja who died young. This Mūlarāja, in a year of famine, got the farmers freed from the payment of revenue. He died soon after. Next year, when the crops were good, the farmers brought the revenues of the last year with the present year. But the king refused to take what he had already let go. The

revenues were ultimately spent in building a Ṣaiva temple in honour of Bāla-Mūlarāja known also as Tripurusha-prāsāda. Bhīma built another temple in honour of Ṣiva, known as Ṣrī Bhīmeṣvaraprāsāda; another of his temple is known as Bhaṭṭārikā Bhiruaṇī-prāsāda. His queen Udayamatī, who was a daughter of Naravāhana Khangara (of Soratha), built a step-well which had beautiful carving. The remains of this step-well are near Patan.

His minister Dāmodara seems to have built a well which must have been a great work of art as we gather from a Gujarati couplet. *

Bhīma, according to the D. K., first offered his throne to Kshemarāja, who, however, refused to accept it, as he wanted to devote his life to religious pursuits. Then Bhīma and Kshemarāja together asked Karṇa to become the king (C. IX v. 73-75). Bhīma died soon after. Kshemarāja retired to Mandukeṣvara near Dadhisthalī, on the banks of the Sarasvatī. Dadhisthalī was given to Devaprasāda son of Kshemarāja, so that he might attend upon his father (vs. 76-77).

Acccrding to the P. C., Karṇa reigned from V. S. 1120 to V. S. 1150 = A. D. 1064 to A. D. 1094 for about thirty years. Two copper-plate grants of his dated V. S. 1131 = A. D. 1075 and V. S. 1148 = A. D. 1092 have been discovered. The first grant contains the geneology from Mūlarāja to Karṇa. It refers to the grant of a village called Dhāmaṇachhā (the modern Dhāmṇā) in Nāgasārikā district (Navasarī).

* राणीकी वाव ने दामोदर कुवो
जेणे न जोयो ते जीवतां मुवो.

The grantee is one Paṇḍita Mahīdhara learned in all Ṣāstras, son of Rudrāditya, grandson of the Brāhmaṇa Madhusūdana of Māndavya gotra hailing from Madhyadeṣa. It is written by Kekā (Kekaka) son of Kāyastha Vaṭeṣvara. The Dūtaka is Mahāsāndhivigrahika Ṣrī Gāditya. This same grant is to be found in another copy. It is dated Ṣaka Samvat 996 (1074 A. D.) a month later than the first one. In the geneology of Karṇa, it omits the name of Chāmuṇḍa. It contains the family history of Ṣrī Durlabheṣa the Mahāmaṇḍaleṣvara of Karṇa for Lāṭa, who seems to have confirmed the original grant.

The second grant of V. S. 1148=A. D. 1092 is issued from Aṇahilapāṭaka. It does not give the geneology. In it Karṇa is called Trailokyamalla. It gives a field in the village called Sunāka in the district of Ānandapura (Vadanagara) containing 126 villages. The field is given for the benefit of a step - well made by Rasovika Thakkura Mahādeva. The grant is written by Akshapāṭalika Kekkaka son of Kāyastha Vaṭeṣvara. The Dūtaka is Mahāsāndhivigrahak Ṣrī Chāhilla. In it the signature is Ṣrī Karṇadevasya.

From the first grant, we learn that before 1075 A. D. the dominion of Karṇa in the south extended beyond Tāpi and Navasāri. This is the usual southern limit of Gujarāta. From the second grant in which Karṇa assumes the title of Trailokyamalla, we may infer that before 1092 A. D. Karṇa had won his main victories.

The D. K. and the P. C., however, do not refer to Karṇa's expeditions or fights against other kings. But from the Sukṛtasamkīrtana and the Surathotsava,

we learn that Karṇa led an expedition against Mālava and inflicted a defeat on the king, bringing with him from Dhārā an image or linga of Nīlakantha Mahādeva. It appears from other sources that Jayasimha son of Bhoja with the help of the Chālukya king Somesvara of the south had regained his power after inflicting a defeat on Karṇa – the king of Chedi – an ally of Bhīma I. Karṇa Solanki of Anahillapura must have defeated this Jayasimha. But Udayāditya, who came on the throne of Mālava after his nephew Jayasimha, regained the lost power.

We learn from an inscription of Sundha Pahādi that Karṇa had to fight with the Chauhāṇas of Nāddula. A severe defeat was inflicted on Karṇa's army. This quarrel with the Chauhāṇs began in the reign of Bhīma I.

From the Karṇasundarī Nātikā of the Kashmiri poet Bilhaṇa – a contemporary work, we learn that Karṇa had sent an expedition to conquer Gajjana–naara (Gajjananagara) under Rucchika, if the name in the play is not imaginary (p. 53). A messenger named Vīrasimha, sent by the successful general, describes, before the king, the battle which took place on the banks of the Sindhu (p. 54).

The S. S. also refers to Karṇa's victory in Sindha.

Most of the accounts about Karṇa, however, occupy themselves with describing his uncommon beauty of person – charming to women (K. K. C. II vs. 20–21), and his love–romances. The Karṇasundarī Nātikā of the Kāshmiri poet Bilhaṇa takes for its plot a love – episode of Karṇa. The heroine is a celestial damsel – a Vidyādharī. The drama follows closely the models of Mālavikāgnimitra – a historical

play of Kālidāsa and the Ratnāvalī of Śrī Harsha, in its plot, as also in other details. We are not able to identify exactly the heroine of the play with any historical personage. This has led to a fanciful explanation of Karṇasundarī* – as the city of Karṇāvatī supposed to be founded by Karṇa as a rival of Aṇahillapura. On the face of it the explnation is absurd and shows a complete misunderstanding of the Samskṛta play and its technique. If any historical person is intended in the character of the Vidyādharī Karṇasundarī, it could be no one else but Mayaṇallā, the beloved queen of Karṇa whose romantic love forms the subject - matter of the ninth canto of the Dvyāśraya Kāvya where the romantic meeting of Mayaṇallā and Karṇa resembles somewhat a similar account in the play. Even though there is no definite evidence to enable us to identify the Vidyādharī with Mayaṇallā, whatever indications we can gather from the play point in that direction. Samskṛta dramatists very often give clues to their characters in the prologues of their plays. The Sūtradhāra, in this play, is at a loss to understand why his wife is not quite sweet with him. He guesses that he might have said something in his dream, referring to the beautiful damsel from the south, whose art and youth he had closely observed as she was dancing before the king. This Dākshiṇātyā Naṭī probably is meant to suggest the heroine Vidyādharī who became Karṇasundarī. This reference to the south, if it suggests

* Karna Solanki by Mr. Ramlal C. Modi in the Bhārtiya Anuśilanagrantha presented to Pt. Gaurishankara Oza, Part III, pp. 14 – 25.

anything, must refer to Mayaṇallā, who was a princess from Karṇāṭaka.

We learn from the play that the name of the Devī – the principal queen – of Karṇa at the time of the play was Sītā. The minister, who is compared to Yaugandharāyaṇa and whose scheming activities are responsible for the whole episode, is Sampatkara popularly known as Sāntu. It was through this relationship that Sampatkara wanted to achieve the Chakravartitva–emperorship–of the king. This probably refers to the fact of an alliance between the king of Karṇāṭaka Vikramāditya VI who was married to a sister of Mayaṇallā, and Karṇa; – an alliance brought about through a common father–in–law. The association of the king of Karṇāṭaka and Karṇa is mentioned on an inscription of Udayāditya of Mālava. It is likely that the minister Saṃpatkara may have been in some way responsible in arranging this match for a political purpose. The play might have been performed after the Gujarat victories in Mālava and Sindha. The marriage of Karṇa with Mayaṇallā must have taken place before these victories.

The account of Karṇa in the Dvyāṣraya mainly concerns itself with describing the romance of Karṇa and Mayaṇallā, their marriage, and the birth of Jayasīmha. Hemachandra devotes about ten verses (178–88) in describing the valour etc. of Karṇa. Then the account of the romance begins. The door–keeper ushers in a painter who has been touring through different parts of India and has drawn wonderful pictures. The artist lays bare before the king, a painting on cloth (ālekhyapaṭa). The king is charmed with a princess

drawn on it, and inquires about her from the painter. The artist answers : " There is a city named Chandrapura in the south. A king named Jayakeṣin reigns there. This princess named Mayaṇallā is the daughter of that king. Glory to her. " Then the artist narrates how this princess even though in full youth refused to marry, and how she ultimately succumbed to the charms of a painting of Kārna shown to her by a travelling artist. Then the artist describes her love-lorn condition. " I, feeling like weeping, painted her in this picture and brought her to you. My work is done ! " (vs. 117 - 18).

The match is arranged and Mayaṇallā comes to marry Karṇa with a big dowry of elephants etc. given by her father. The whole party encamps outside the city. Karṇa goes to see the elephants incognito with an attendant. There he sees the princess in a latāgṛha - a bower of creepers. From her Cholaka - a sort of boddice - he infers that she is a virgin and makes inquiries of her name etc. Her attendants inform the king that ' she has graced the Kadamba family. '

Hemachandra informs us that Mayaṇallā was made Mahishī, i. e. the principal queen.

We know from the history of the Kadamba family that Jayakeṣin's forefathers ruled in Chandrapura (Chandor in Salestta Tāluka near Goa) and ṭhat Jayakeṣin, himself having conquered Goa, transferred his capital there. Jayakeṣin died in the year V. S. 1136 - A. D. 1080. The marriage took place when he was alive. From the D. K. we learn that Karṇa married Mayaṇallā after he came to the throne. The event might have happened in the early part of his

reign. In that case, the marriage must have taken place between A. D. 1064 and A. D. 1080.

We gather from the D. K. (X v. - 2) that for a long time after their marriage they had no issue. Karṇa goes to the temple of the goddess Ṣrī (Srīveśma) or Lakshmī, the consort of Vishṇu, and propitiates her by praying and by practising austerities. Karṇa's devotion is tested in various ways. First the heavenly damsels try to tempt him, but they fail; then a terrible male-form tries to frighten him, but it also fails. The goddess is pleased and grants him his desire.

The canto XI begins with the description of the ideal love of the king and the queen. Mayaṇallā bears a child. A son is born. Astrologers, riding on horses, come to the palace. His glorious future is fore - cast. He is revealed to be an incarnation of Rāmachandra (v. 20). The elderly ladies of the family gave him the name of Jayasimha (v. 39) - a different type of name - reminiscient of his maternal grand-father's name - Jayakeṣin. + According to the P. P. S. Jayasimha was eight years old when Karṇa died. If this date is correct, Jayasimha's birth must have taken place in V. S. 1142 - A. D. 1086.

The account of the P. C. — that Mayaṇallā was very ugly and that Karṇa, who first refused but later on consented to marry her under a threat of suicide from his mother Queen Udayamatī, had great dislike for Mayaṇallā, - should be discredited as utterly going against the much earlier testimony of Hemachandra,

+ The word केशिन् means सिंह that is lion. So the names are identical in meaning.

who would not not have described their passionate love in such glowing terms if the things were as described in the P. C.. If the facts were as the P. C. relates Hemachandra would rather have remained silent on the point. The other part of the scandalous story that the minister Munjāla secretly substituted Mayanallā for a low - born woman to whom Karṇa was attached and that consequently she bore a child may equally be discredited.

The P. C. tells us that when Jayasimha was three years old, he mounted the throne in play. This being rather ominous the king, acting on the advice of his astrologers, crowned the boy king. He then went to suppress the turbulent Bhilla chief Āṣā of Aṣāpalli and founded a city, or more probably renamed Āṣāpalli which became known after him as Karṇāvatī, and ruled there as king. The suppression of Aṣā and the founding of the city or renaming Āṣāpalli are historical facts. But the crowning of Jayasimha at the age of three does not seem probable.

The Dvyāṣraya tells us that when Jayasimha had finished his studies and was coming of age, Karṇa after consulting his ministers asked him to accept the throne so that he might lead a retired life, devoted to Hari (God). Jayasimha first refused but on his father pressing him, he consented, and so was crowned king. Karṇa asked Jayasimha to look after his brother's son Devaprasāda and his descendants.

The P. P. S. tells us that when Jayasimha was eight years old, Srī Karṇa died. He was trained for rulership (Guṇaṣreṇī) by the minister Santu even when he was eight years old (p. 35).

It appears from the D. K. that Karṇa became a devotee of Hari or Vishṇu. When he is persuading Jayasiṃna to accept the throne, he says " Before the female - serpent old age bites this bird of my soul, it is time for me to meditate on that God whose hands are as long as the king of serpents (Ṣesharāja) who lies on his serpent-couch, whose insignia is the bird that kills the serpents (Garuḍa), who wears a garment of the colour (yellow) of the king of birds (Garuḍa), and who has made the difficult path to heaven easily accessible (v. 95 - 96). Again when referring to his death, Hemachandra calls him " Brahamavādī and Harismārī. " We saw that Karṇa propitiated Lakshmī for a son. We may, however, note that in his copper-plates, he is referred to as worshipping Ṣiva. So also in the Karṇasundarī. This means that he might have become a Vaishṇava in the latter part of his reign after the birth of Jayasiṃha.

From the P. C., we learn that while proceeding to fight Asā, he received signs of good luck from the goddess Bhairavadevī and so Karṇa built a temple in honour of that goddess Kochharaba (probably connected with Kocharab - a suburb of Ahmedabad) - and another in honour of the goddess Jayantīdevī at the place where he defeated the Bhilla chieftain. He also built in Karṇāvatī a temple known as Karṇeṣvaradevatāyatana and also a lake called Karṇa-sāgara which may be the original of the present-day Kānkaria Talao which was also known as Hoz-e-kutub. In Ṣrī Pattana he built a temple known as Ṣri Karṇa - Meru Prāsāda (p. 55). Near Moḍherā also, he built a lake and a temple known after him.

From his copper - plates we learn that two of his Mahāsandhivigrahikas were Ṣrī Gāditya and Ṣrī Chāhila. From the Karṇasundarī, we learn that his principal minister whose intelligence and loyalty, the poet describes at some length. was Sampatkara. Sampatkara or Santu continued to mind the affairs of the state even in the time of Jayasimha.

I have referred to the Karṇasundarī Nāṭikā of Bilhaṇa. This Bilhaṇa was a sojourner in Aṇahillapura. He was a poet from Kāṣmira who stayed for a while in the capital of Gurjardeṣa when he was out, travelling in India, seeking fortune. He gives a sort of his autobiography in the XVIII canto of his poem Vikaramāṇkadevacharita. According to it he was a native of Khoṇamukha, a village near Pravarapura (v. 71) (according to Dr. Bühler, at a distance of three miles from Pravarapura in Kāṣmira. His father's name was Jyeshṭhakalaṣa whom he describes as very learned (Sārasvata-rasa-nidhāna and Ṣruti-nidhi) and his having composed a commentary on the Mahābhāshya (79). His mother's name was Nāgadevī whom he describes as an in house - management (80). The poet then describes adept himself as one in whose mouth the goddess of Speech resided from the time he became a student (81). He was a master of the Vedas with their Aṇgas, of the Mahābhāshya of Patanjali, and the beautiful art of Poetry and Poetics was his very life - breath (82).

Before he came to Aṇhillapura, he had visited Mathurā, Kānyakubja, etc. He stayed for some time in the court of Karṇa of Chedi (vs. 93) who, as we saw, was a contemporary of Bhīma I. Bilhaṇa avoided Dhārā, probably because there was enmity between

Chedı and Mālava, though he writes in his boasting style that Dhārā was sorry that he did not go there. From Chedı, he came to Aṇahillapura. He must have come there in the early part of Karṇa's reign, probably soon after Karṇa's marriage with Mayaṇallā. It may be that he might have written the play to commemorate the event. *

It appears his stay in Aṇahillapura was not of such consequence as to deserve mention in his self-eulogistic account. He merely refers to it ' as contact with Gurjars on the way.' He was disgusted with their speech and with their way of wearing dhoti. His references to Aṇahillapattana, and to Karṇa, and his eulogy of the Mahāmātya Sampatrkara in the Karṇasundarī, however, tell a dıfferent tale. It might be that because he wrote his Vikramānkadevacharita in the court of Āhavamalla a rival Chālukya king, he had to make slighting references to the Gurjaras, or it might be that his unchecked arrogance which he reveals in his auto-biographic account met with a check in the court of Aṇahillapura and that his vanity was wounded. However that may be, the blemishes of speech and dress which Bilhaṇa refers to must not be regarded as unreal.

* Mr. Ramlal Modi thinks that the play must have been written not in the time of Karṇa, but in the early part of Jayasimha's reıgn, because the plav is not acted in one of Kaıṇa's Ṡaiva temples, but in the Jaina temple of Sampatakara. This argument, I think, is flimsy, and is based upon an ignorance of the customs of the times. It was an usual thing in those days, for such plays to be acted in Jaina temples on festive occasions; and a foreign poet might very well write a play for the festival in the temple of the prime-minister.

Bilhaṇa went to Somanātha and from there took boat, in the opinion of Dr. Bühler, from the neighbouring port of Verāvala and voyaged to the south. He settled in the court of Āhavamalla–the Chālukya king of Kalyāṇa, as the Vidyāpati, or Master of Learning.

Another great figure whose activities extended up to the middle of Karṇa's reign was Abhayadevasūri. He is known as the Navāngī tīkā-kāra that is a commentator on the nine Angas of the Jainas He is different from the Abhayadevasūri who was a teacher of Ṣāntisūri and the author of that great commentary on the Sanmati - tarka of Siddhasena Divākara. He was a son of Mahīdhara, a rich man of Dhārā. His mother's name was Dhanadevī. It was through the influence of Abhayadeva that a big temple in honour of Pārṣvanātha was built on the banks of the river Sedhi or Seti in Gujarat. The rich men of Dholka who had accompanied Abhayadevasūri collected a fund of a lac of rupees to build the temple. The land was given by the villagers. Āmreṣvara, a pupil of Ṣrī Mallavādin who was an expert in architecture was made the headman. In addition to his food etc., he got one dramma daily as his wages. From this payment, he saved some money and built a small temple himself which existed in the time of the author of the Pr. Ch. (pp. 267 - 272).

Abhayadevasūri died in the reign of Karṇa somewhere between V. S. 1135 - 39 = A. D. 1079 - 1083.

According to the D. K., Karṇa died peacefully as a 'Brahmavādī and a Harismārī'. But the Hammiramadamardana suggests that Karṇa was killed by Duhṣāla in battle. For many reasons which Mr. Ramlal

Modi has ably given in his article on Karṇa (pp. 20–21), it appears that this incident referred to in a poem written three-hundred years later cannot be believed as against the almost contemporary account of Hemachandra.

14

Siddharāja Jayasiṃha is the most remembered of the kings of Gujarata. He still lives in folk – literature and folk-drama. + Like Vikrama and Bhoja he has become almost a legendary figure. In fact, it appears to be the ambition of Jayasimha to become like Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī in all aspects of life. Jayasimha's behaviour with such a conscious aim in view explains the lasting impression that he made on the imagination of the people of his own as well as of later generations. Otherwise it would be inexplicable to understand why the Dvyāṣraya Kāvya which gives a normal historical account of the preceding kings of Aṇahillapura from Mūlarāja to Karṇa, as also of the succeeding king Kumārapāla, gives a super-normal account of the contemporary king Jayasimha. This can be explained on the assumption that the uncommon personality of Jayasimha was assuming a legendary character in his own times. In fact, Jayasimha is better known as Siddharāja * or Siddhīraja (as he is called in the

+ The Veṣa of Sadharo Jesang,—that is, how Siddharāja Jayasiṃha is known to folk-literatnre – still forms an important item in the traditional stock of folk-playlets performed by Bhavaiyas – a caste of hereditary actors.

* Siddharāja may be understood either as the king of Siddhas or as the king who is a Siddha – a master of Siddhis. For another and historically more probable implication of the word see furthe on.

D. K.) which means a lord of Siddhis—super - natural powers. We shall have occasion to refer to this aspect when we came to the account of the D. K.

In addition to the inscriptions, and literary accounts, we have been utilizing up till now, we are fortunate in possessing, for this period, other sources of information which help us in arranging some of the events of his reign chronologically. These are the colophons of some of the contemporary manuscripts. This important material was first made known by Muni Srī Jinavijayaji in his address which he delivered as an Honorary Member of the Gujarat Sāhitya Sabhā.

As to the additional literary sources, we may note the Siddha - Hema grammar, the Deṣīnāmamāla, the Chhandonuṣāsana, and other works of Hemachandra; the Vāgbhaṭālamkāra of Vāgbhaṭa in which Jayasiṃha is referred to in about ten verses, the Gaṇaratnamahodadhi (completed in V. S. 1197=A. D. 1141) of Vardhamāna sūri, some verses of another contemporary writer Sāgara-chandra quoted in the G. R. M., and the drama called Mudritakumudachandra of Yaṣaschandra which gives an account of the controversy held between Kumuda-chandra, a Diagambara Āchārya and Devasūri, a Ṣvetāmbara Ācharya, and incidentally describes the learned assembly of Jayasiṃha and refers to some of its literary figures.

The Ṣatārthakāvya of Somaprabhasūri - a contemporary of Kumārapāla–has for one of its hundred interpretations Jayasimha as the subject.

Two Islamic writers also supply us with some useful material. One is the geographer Al - Idrisi,

author of the Nuzhat - ul - Mushtak who visited the court of Jayasimha (C. H. I, Vol. III, p. 517 and the B. G. Vol. I p. 508). The other is Muhammad Ufi the author of Jame - ul - Hikayata (N. P. P. Vol. II, pp. 163 - 64).

The Prabandhachintāmaṇi gives forty-nine years' reign to Jayasimha, from V. S. 1150 to V. S. 1199 A. D. 1094 - 1143. In the unpublished collection of Gujarata Inscriptions of Muni Ṣri Jinavijayaji, nine inscriptions of Jayasimha's reign are noted; so also, in his address referred to, he has noted nine dated references to Jayasimha in the colophons of various manuscripts. A fragment of the praṣasti of the Lake Sahasralinga was deciphered by Jinavijaya on a slab of stone set in the wall of a small Ṣaiva temple in Vijaliamoholla (Patana), which was first noticed by Mr. Ramlal Modi (see Prasthāna, Vol. 12, pp. 213-298).

Now the first question that faces us is the age at which Jayasimha was consecrated king. From the D. K. as we have already noted, we gather that he was just reaching youth when he was asked by his father to assume kingly position. He is compared to a plant of Vrīhi corn which is forming sheaves or clusters in Ṣarad - months of September - October. (Yathā stambakarer Vrīhih sa tadāsīt tathodayī (v. 57).) The verses that follow show him to be a brave and obedient lad.

From the P. P. S., we learn that he was eight years old whe Karṇa died and from the P. C., we learn that he was formally crowned king when three years of age. The P. P. S. tells us that he was being trained for kingly duties by his minister Sampatkara.

From this evidence, we may infer that Jayasimha was not of age when he came to the throne.

The main event in the time of Jayasimha's minority or the early part of his reign was an attack on Aṇahillapura by Naravarman * the king of Mālava when Jayasimha was absent on a pilgrimage to Somanātha with his mother Mayaṇallā or Minaladevī, as she is called in the Gujarati. Probably the best part of the army was with the young King and Queen-Mother. So Sampatakara or Sāntu who was in charge of the capital had to make peace with the invader by giving, as the P. C. says, Jayasimha's merit of pilgrimage to Somanātha. It is a question whether the invader was satisfied with merely religious merit. Anyhow when Jayasimha returned, he resolved upon to retrieve his honour by waging a war against Mālava.

When on pilgrimage to Somanātha, the Queen-mother used to encamp a few miles ahead of the king. As she approached Bāhuloḍa × a place where the pilgrim-tax was levied, she found some poor pilgrims, who could not pay the tax, returning in great sorrow. Mayaṇallā's religious sensibility was greatly affected and she, out of sympathy, returned with them. When Jayasimha

* The P.C. gives the name of the invader as Yaśovarman, but at the time Naravarman was on the throne of Mālava. See Pandita Oza's article on Jayasimha in the N. P. P. Vol. IX, p. 268. Mr. Ramalal thinks that this attack was made by the Chauhan king Yojaka Nadula on the strength of a general reference in an inscription two hundred years later than this event. There is no confirmatory evidence for this opinion.

× The identity of the place Bāhuloḍa has caused some discussion amongst scholars. Two places—one on the boundary of Gujarata and Kathiawada known as Bholāda and the other

was informed of the incident he let go the whole tax to satisfy his mother, which according to the P. C., amounted to seventytwo lacs of the current coin. ×

The first contemporary record of Jayasimha's reign that has been discovered up till now is a colophon dated V. S. 1157-A. D. 1101, that is seven years after his accession to the throne. In this, the reference is simply - Ṣrī Jayasiṁhadeva rājye - i. e. 'in the reign of Ṣrī Jayasimha.' This simple mention of his name without any titles is indicative of his minority; and its sole purpose is just to record the name of the occupant of the throne.

---

near Ṣuklatīrtha on the river Narmadā known as Bhāloda - are put forward as representing Bāhuloḍa, where the pilgrim-tax was levied. Mr. Ramlal Modi holds the latter view. He says that the tax was levied from the pilgrims of the south; so the place must be on the southern boundary. On what evidence he says that the tax was levied only from the southern pilgrims, he does not indicate (p. 17 Article on Karṇa.). As far as I know, there is no mention of such a distinction. It is absurd to assume a place, hundreds of miles away from Somanātha, as the place where the pilgrim-tax was levied. Bholāda on the boundary of Kathiawada and Gujarata would have a better claim if no nearer place of the same name could be discovered. As it is, Muni Jinavijayaji has drawn my attention to one Bāhuloda near the foot of the Girnara mountain. It is mentioned in the Prāchīn Gurjara Kāvya Sangraha. P. 73

एउ वाउहलोडउं कोटउ तलि नियसइ गिरिनारु ।
ओ दीसइ ववणथली धवलियतुग पयार [रु] ॥ २४

(The reading नियसइ is not found in the printed text of the G. O S. but J. V. has found it in a manuscript from a Pāṭan Bhandar). This Vāuhaloḍa or Bāhuloḍa would be the most appropriate place to levy tax on the pilgrims for Somanātha.

× These events-attack of Naravarman and the remission of the pilgrim tax-are not mentioned in the D. K.

The colophon of V. S. 1164 = A. D. 1108 is our second contemporary reference. In it we find Jayasimha described thus : Samasta – Rājāvalī–Virājita–Mahārāja-dhirāja – Paramesvara Ṣrī Jayasimhadeva rājye. This indicates that by V. S. 1164, when Jayasimha might be twenty – two years of age, he had assumed full powers. Two years later in the colophon of V. S. 1166 = A. D. 1110 we find the significant title ' Tribhuvana-gaṇda ' * which means ' the guardian of the three worlds. ' We may infer from this that Jayasimha's military adventures might have begun by this time and that he was exercising full sovereign–powers.

In the colophon of the month Fālguṇa of the V. S. 1179, the same titles continue with an additional ' Ṣrīmat.' From the same colophon, we learn that Santu was then the Mahāmātya or Chief Minister. In the colophon of the month of Bhādrapada of the same year, we find that the chief minister is Āṣuka. This means that Santu had retired. The king has the additional title of Siddhachakravartin.

After this, in my opinion, should be placed that inscription of Jayasimha, in which the digit for the decimal place cannot be made out. × The king is

* The word ' gaṇda ' is deṣya meaning ' a chief of police ' दाण्डपाशिक. See the Deṣināmamāla p. 106 B. S. S.

× Dr. Devadatta Bhandarkar read the year as 1200. But, from all accounts, Kumārapāla was reigning in that year. Jinavijayaji reads it as 11 ? 0. If we put the figure ' 8 ' it will suit the context well.

‡ This inscription records the grant of some money to मो० (probably मोजक) for performing plays in the temple of the goddess Sri Bahughṛṇā probably Bahucharā.

described in it as Samasta - Rājāvali–Virājita–Mahā-rājādhirāja Ṣrī Jayasimhadeva. ‡

This inscription gives the name of the Chief Minister as Āṣvāka. This Āṣvāka is the same as the Āṣuka of the colophon of Bhādrapada V. S. 1179. We also learn from the PrabhāvakaCh. that when Devasūri after defeating Kumudachandra in a public debate refused to accept money offered to him by king Jayasimha, his minister Āṣuka advised the king to build a Jaina Temple with it as Devasūri was indifferent to wealth (p. 295 vs. 270 - 271). Now we know that this debate took place in V. S. 1181. This corroborates the evidence of the colophon as well as the inscription. The title Siddha - chakravarti in the colophon indicates that between the months of Falguna and Bhadrapada of V. S. 1179 Barbarka must have been defeated and made a slave. This title is not given in the inscription probably because it had not yet become current outside the capital where, however, the colophon of V. S. 1179 was written.

Thus we find that by the end of the year V. S. 1179 the first great deed of Jayasimha's life was achieved.

Now the first deed of Jayasimha that the D. K. describes is his fight with Barbaraka who was troubling the sages of the time who approach Jayasimha to request him to kill the Rākshasa. (This is reminiscent of Rāma and Viṣvāmitra, and the killing of demons who were troubling Viṣvāmitra.). The whole of the twelfth canto of the D. K. is devoted to this episode. We learn from it that Barbaraka had come with his men as far as Ṣrīsthalapura (Siddhapura) on the Sarasvatī and devasted the holy place and the temple

of Svayambhū - Rudra - Mahākāla - Deva (5, 6, 13). The sages say that even a Chālukya child could protect them (14). This may have reference to the young age of the king. Jayasimha encamps on the river Sarasvatī. Barbaraka, who comes to know of it, sends his men to fight Jayasimha's army. A terrible fight ensues, and Jayasimha's army begins to fly away from the battlefield. Jayasimha himself goes to fight and his vetrin or door-keeper by his heroic speech brings back the soldiers to fight again. Barbaraka also comes to the battle-field and a mortal combat ensues between him and Jayasimha. Jayasimha strikes a blow on the head of Barbaraka with his sword which breaks into two. They wrestle with each other and the king so compresses the gaint in his arms that he vomits blood and swoons. Barbaraka is tied and made a prisoner. Then the wife of Barbaraka named Pingalikā (76) requests the king to release her husband, and undertakes to keep him in order. Thenceforth Barbaraka becomes a very faithful follower of the king. * We learn from the first verse of the thirteenth canto that Barbaraka presented the king with heaps of gold coins and rubies. He also showed Jayasimha how he could remain under sea by Viṣna method (4).

Who this Barbaraka was-we are not able to say definitely. The D. K. refers to him as the leader of Rākshasas. Other synonyms of the word Rākshasa are also used for him and his tribe. Another contemporary

* According to many authorities, he was a powerful ally of Jayasimha in his war with Khengāra of Saurāshṭra and Ya ovarman of Mālava.

work – the Vāgbhaṭālamkāra – calls Barbaraka a 'naktanchara' meaning a 'rākshasa'. + From this we may infer that in the view of Hemachandra, these people, whose leader Barbaraka was, were of some non-Aryan tribes who did not care for the gods of the Aryans. Otherwise they would not desecrate the temple of Rudra on the Sarasvatī.

Whoever may have been this Barbaraka, his subjugation and enslavement at the hands of Jayasimha gave the conqueror a mythical character in the eyes of his people. This Barbaraka was regarded by later generations as a Bhūta or an evil spirit and according to the Kumārapālaprabandha of Jinamanḍana * Jayasimha was called Siddha, because he subjugated this Bābarā Bhūta as he is called in the Gujarati. × The protection that was ensured to his people by the defeat of this

---

+ Ṣloka 125. येन नक्तंचरः सोऽपि युद्धे बर्बरको जितः ।
[वाग्भटालङ्कार. परि. ४; १२५.]

The commentary of Simhadevagaṇi on the V. L. quotes another verse which also seems to be contemporary.

जय जय बब्बरजिष्णो विष्णोरवतार भूप जयसिंह ॥ (Ibid p. 17).

* सिद्धो बर्वरकश्चास्य सिद्धराजस्ततोऽभवत् ।

× Regarding Barbaraka, see B. G. Vol. I, foot-note p. 174. In the Mahābhārata, in one list of Anaryan tribes, Barbaras are mentioned between Kirātas and Siddhas. May it not be that Jayasimha was called Siddharāja because he subjugated these Anaryans who were also called Siddhas? In south Kathiawad, there is a province called Babariāwāḍa. Probably they were pirates and were very wealthy. See also The History of Saurāshṭra by Bhagvanlal Sampatram pp. 63 – 65. The identification of Barbaras with Rabāris is an interesting hypothesis.

Barbaraka entitled him to assume the title of Siddhachakravartin – the Siddha Emperor.

The same titles continue in the colophon of the year V. S. 1179 (A. D. 1123), and in the two colophons of the year V. S. 1191 (A. D. 1135). This may indicate that his main victories were yet to come.

Hemachandra devotes the thirteenth canto of the D. K. to the description of Jayasimha's nocturnal rounds in the city and outside to hear what people say and to remove their grievances. When once on such a round, he came to the river Sarasvatī and crossed it. He heard from the Daṣāvatāri Ārama near the river, (that is a park where there was a Daṣavatarī temple,) a moaning sound. There he finds the king of Nāgas – Ratnachūda and his wife. This Ratnachūda was of Bhogavatī in Pātāla. He helps this Ratnachūda by taking out salt-water from a well infested with wasps ahd saves him from suicide. How this incident mentioned in a contemporary work can be interpreted, I do not know. +

We learn from the Prabhāvakacharita that in V. S. 1181-A. D. 1125 the famous controversy between Kumudachandra – the Digambara and Devasūri – the Ṣvetāmbara was held in the court of Jayasimha. We shall have occassion to refer to this event later on. *

+ Bhogavatī in Pātāla has recently been identified with Khambhata (Cambay) bv Mr. Ratnamanirao Zote. Has this episode anything to do with the incident mentioned by Muhumad Ufi in the Jame – ul – Hikayata? See N. P. P. Vol. IX, p. 291, Pt. Oza's article.

* The Mudrita – kumudachandra which has for its plot the

The second colophon of the V. S. 1191-A. D. 1135 is of the month Fālguna - the year beginning with the month of Chaitra. In the colophon of the month of Jyeṣhṭha in the year V. S. 1192 A. D. 1136, that is about three months later we find the additional title of Avantīnātha - Lord of Avanti. This shows that Jayasimha got his final decisive victory over Mālava within these three months.

The P. P. S., the P. C. and other works give many details about this war with Mālava. One is that this war lasted for twelve years. If this tradition is correct we can say that the war in the reign of Jayasimha must have begun in the year V. S. 1180. This does not mean that Jayasimha was out of Aṇahillapura fighting for these twelve years. For, as we saw, in the year V. S. 1181, Kumudachandra and Devasūri held their dialectical duel in his presence at Anahillapura. It was only the last attack that Jayasimha led personally. This is the impression that we derive from the D. K. also.

The fourteenth canto of the poem is devoted to this episode. We are told that as Jayasimha used to go out for his usual morning-ride on a male or female elephant or on a horse, no body could suspect

debate of Devasūri and Kumudachandra has two verses describing Jayasimha. In this play, he is generally referred to as Siddharāja. From these verses we learn that Jayasimha had brought Barbaraka under his subjection, that he could frighten Ṣākinīs (evil spirits embodied in female forms) and assemble Yoginīs and that the 'Vīra' that he was - he was wandering freely in the cemetery at night with his sword in his hand. (P. 21 Act II, V. 21, p. 50 Act V v. 14). As the conquest of Mālava is not referred to, the play was probably written before V. S. 1192.

anything about his nightly vigilence, and that people were consequently surprised to find that Jayasimha knew everything about them. So they thought that he was a superhuman being - a Vidyādhara (v. 3). This was probably the popular belief about Jayasimha even in his own times. In those days such beliefs were common and easily formed. Hemachandra tells us that Jayasimha would even accost the Ṣākinīs and Yoginīs - super-natural female embodiments of spirits and take them to task if they troubled his people. Once when on such a nocturnal round, he met the Yoginī Kāli of Avanti who threatened Jayasimha with her displeasure if he did not offer worship to her and make friends with Yaṣovarman - king of Avanti, that is, Mālava. The king asked her to do her worst and protect her devotee Yaṣovarman whom he was going to catch alive in battle. He told her if he did not succeed in that he would then offer her worship.

The king seizing his sword gathered his army and started immediately (v. 20). With lightning speed he appeared on the shores of the Siprā. A seige was laid round Ujjayinī and instructions were given by Jayasimha to raze the ramparts to the ground.

In the evening, the operations were suspended and Jayasimha went out to see the beauty of the surroundings of Ujjayinī. There he finds the Yoginīs Kāli and others—the guardian-spirits of Ujjayinī - talking and conspiring to kill him. In the fight that follows he spares Kāli and her friends because they were women. 'Being the son of a good mother,+ he

+ Sammātṛatvena. The commentator explains as: 'because

was naturally compassionate' (v. 64). Kāli the guardian spirit of Ujjayinī was pleased with his generosity and promises that Jayasimha would conquer Yaṣovarman and other kings. (66 – 68).

Yaṣovarman comes to know of this incident and flies away that very night to Dhārā which was a 'Sudurga' – a better fort – (v. 70). In the morning Jayasiṃha led his soldiers and Ujjayinī was 'broken'. He himself proceeded to Dhārā and "This great hero of the Chālukyas, like a dancer dancing his sword on the battle-field, seized the lord of Mālavas who had entered Dhārā' (v. 72). The king Yaṣovarman was then made a prisoner. (v. 73).

This is a how Hemachandra describes the greatest event of Jayasimha's reign. Presumably it only touches the last expedition of the great war of twelve years. The super-natural element of Yoginīs is difficult to explain, though it does not come in the way of understanding the event. Jayasiṃha's meeting of Ujjayinī's Yoginī Kāli in Aṇahillapura might signify that Jayasimha was not successful in the early stages of the war, that overtures for making a friendly alliance with Yaṣovarman were made to Jayasimha, and that he rejected them.

Tradition has preserved many details of this war with Mālava. Some of them may be noted here. We learn from the Vāgbhaṭālaṃkāra that it was Barbaraka who built a sort of bridge on the river Siprā (Pari IV v. 152), presumably to enable the army to cross it.

According to the G.manuscript of the P. P. S. 'when deliberation on the conduct of war was being

---

he was the son of Mayaṇallā who was a sammātā because she possessed all the qualities like compassion etc.'

held with the minister Āliga, a Chāraṇa that is a minstrel said 'Dhārā cannot be taken by people having religious marks * on their fore-heads! Jesal who can beat even Yama – Lord of Death should come.' A letter was sent to Jesala who was then a prisoner. After consulting his father, Jesala led the attack on Dhārā riding a powerful elephant named Yaṣahpataha or Jasapadaha. The elephant rushed at the gate and smashed it, but at the cost of his own and Jesala's life (p. 35).

According to the P. C., when Jayasimha could not take the fort of Dhārā, he consulted Munjāla–a minister from his father's time–who informed the king that he had learnt from his emissaries in Dhārā that they had overheard an inhabitant of the place saying "If the army of the enemy attacks the south gate, Dhārā could be stormed otherwise not." Jayasimha personally led the attack riding his powerful elephant Yasahpaṭaha with Ṣāmala as the driver. 'The elephant charged the big iron bar fastening the gates and broke it, but he was 'broken within,' and as the driver after making the son of Karṇa (Jayamsimha) descend, was himself getting down, the elephant fell on the ground. As the elephant died like a warrior, he took the form of Vināyaka under the name of Yaśodhavala (the god Gaṇapati) in the village of Vaḍasara.' This means

* एहे टीलालेहिं धार न लीजइं करणउत्र ।
जम जेहे प्रउंचेहि जोइइ जेसलु आवतउ ॥

(p. 35) (See also p. 23.)

This is a fling at the religious people in the army. It is known that Bāwas formed a considerable part of the king's army in those days. See the B. G. Vol. I. p. 14. Or it may be a fling at the Jaina ministers and generals of the army.

that a memorial was raised in his honour in the form of a white Gaṇapati - image in that village. The P. C. quotes a verse in praise of this Vināyaka suggesting this incident (p. 59).

The triumphal march of the conquering hero riding on a majestic elephant with the royal prisoner Yaṣovarman of Mālava bearing in his hand a wooden sword * through Anahillapura must have been an occasion of the greatest jubilation in the history of that city. Contemporary inscriptions in verse and prose mention the defeat and imprisonment of Yaṣovarman in so many words as if it had become a part of the royal writ. The Prabandhas dilate upon the occasion. Many must have been the panegyrics sung by bards and poets. A few of these, in the Saṃskṛta, the Prākṛta and the Apabhraṃṣa, have been preserved in the Prabandhas and other works. ×

We saw from the colophons that the conquest of Mālava took place between V. S. 1191 month of Fālguna and V. S. 1192, month of Jyeshṭha — the year being

* According to the P. C. the wooden sword was substituted for the real sword at the suggestion of the minister Munjāla who threatened to resign if Jayasimha refused to act according to his advice. If these incidents mentioned by the P. C. are historical, Munjāla must have been very old at the time of Mālava victory; because he was a Mahām tya of Karṇa in the year V. S. 1146 A. D. 1090.

× Hemachandra himself composed about sixteen stanzas placed at the end of his grammar Siddha - Hema. Some more are given in the Chhandonuṣāsana and other works. Vāgbhata in his Alamkāra and Vardhamānasūri in his Gaṇaratnamahodadhi give verses referring to this event.

a Chaitrādi that is one beginning with the month of Chaitra (A. D. 1136). The final battle must have taken place within these three months. We find in a mutilated inscription of V. S. 1193 – A. D. 1137 discovered at Gala (in Dhrangadhara State, Kathiawada,) among Jayasimha's titles, the title of Avantīnātha, that is Lord of Avantī, also. This is a further corroborative evidence of his victory over Mālava.

This inscription refers to some temple of the Goddess Ṣrī Bhattarikā Ṣrī Devatā and a small temple of Gaṇapati in Drumatīrtha Khāṇi. Something is done by five people – panchakula – * one of whose names can be red as Pāri, Srī Kumara, another as Pāri Kera ...... The Mahāmātya or the Chief minister was Ambāprasāda in charge of the treasury – Vyaya-karaṇa. The engraver was Maho......K.

A later inscription of V. S. 1195 = A. D. 1139 found at Ujjain (Ujjayinī) in Mālava mentions the defeat of Yaṣovarman in so many words. We find all the titles of Jayasimha in this inscription – Mahārājādhi-rāja Parameṣvara, Tribhuvanagaṇḍa, Siddha Chakravarti, Avantinātha, Barbarakajishṇu, Srī Jayasimhadeva – vijaya–rājye.

This inscription, though incomplete, gives us other important information also. We learn that Mahattama + Srī Dādāka was minding the 'Ṣrīkaraṇādi' affairs, i. e. chief ministerial functions. He was a Nāgara. His son Mahādeva who was the principal military officer in Mālava was also the

* This word generally means a tax – collector.

+ Mahattama appears to be the Samskṛta original of the Gujarati surname Mehta.

23

Governor of the place. It appears that he or his father was one of the principal generals of Jayasimha in his war with Mālava.

Another inscription of the same year but found at Bhadreśvara in Cutch gives us similar information. The two additional titles are–Dhārāvidambaka, (molester of Dhārā) and Trailokyamalla – (champion of the three worlds). The prime minister at Anahillapāṭaka was Śrī Dādāka. Something is given for the worship of Śri Udāleśvara and Sri Kurapāleśvara in a new temple built by Sri Kurapāla – son of Sri Āsapāla, son of Toḍi, son of Mahārāja. The inscription is incomplete.

The inscription of V. S. 1196 = A. D. 1140 found at Dohad gives us some more historical information. Excepting the last line, the whole of it is in verse. It begins with a Namaskāra to Vāsudeva. We learn from it that Jayasimha had thrown into prison the kings of Surāshṭra and Mālava (v. 1); he, also, had uprooted other kings, and made the kings of the north carry his orders (v. 2). In the third verse, his capital Aṇahilla-pāṭakanagara whose temples obstruct the path of the sun is compared to Ayodhyā of Rāma. The fourth verse tells us that the Vāhinīpati (probably meaning captain of a battalion) Keśava was made the general of the army in the Dadhipadra District (Dohad District) by the king residing in the capital. The fifth verse informs us that this general Keśava built a temple in honour of Goganārāyaṇa in memory of his mother in Dadhipadra. *

*An inscription of V. S. 1198 – A. D. 1142 of the subordinate king Someśvara has been found at Kiradu in the Jodhapur–state.

An inscription discovered at Sambhara consisting of twenty

The defeat and imprisonment of the ruler of Surāshṭra and the uprooting of Sindhurāja and other kings and the submission of northern kings are the new historical facts gathered from this inscription. The D. K. does not mention any one of these events excepting that Jayasimha 'after putting under check the roguish kings made the way to Kedāradeva safe' (XV 14). This may refer to northern kings.

The defeat of Sindhurāja, however, is referred to by Hemachandra in his Chhandonuṣāsana (p, 12) and by Vāgbhaṭa in his Alaṃkāra (p. 57).

Who this Sindhurāja was is not yet settled. According to Simhadevagaṇi, a commentator of the Vāgbhaṭālamkāra, he was Sindhudeṣādhipa, i. e. the lord of Sindh. But, as the B. G. says "Nothing is known regarding the Sindh war."

In the K. K., and in the Vasanta-vilāsa mahākāvya, however, we find that Saṇkha whose other name was Sangrāmasiṃha is called the son of Sindhurāja. * Again in the K. K. we find that Ṣankha asks Vastupāla to hand over Cambay to him, 'because as you know, this city was subject to my father (-pitṛbhukti,)' while Vastupāla answers him that it was taken by Nṛpasiṃha

-eight verses but unfortunately very much mutilated gives the whole geneology of the Chālukya family. After the eleventh verse, however, the inscription is so broken that we are not able to make much sense of what remains. We learn from it that in V. S. 998, Mūlarāja was reigning. But, the date of the inscription itself is destroyed.

Another small and broken inscription without date found at Girināra refers to the Jaina Tirthankara Neminātha. It mentions the ruling king as Siddha Chakrapati Ṣrī Jayasinghadeva.

after fighting with Siṃha who was assisted by 'cavalry-men.' The reference is undoubtedly to Jayasimha and Sindhurāja because we find that the K. K. when referring to Jayasimha's fight with Sindhurāja mentions the attribute 'of having a strong cavalry' with reference to Sindhurāja. On the strength of these references, Muni Jinavijayaji, I think, rightly identifies Sindhurāja whom Jayasimha uprooted as the father of Ṣankha who wanted to take back Cambay which was a part of Lāta from Vastupāla. ×

We cannot, however, say in which year this defeat of Sindhurāja took place. It, however, did take place before V. S. 1196 – A. D. 1140.

As to the other event mentioned by the inscription, viz; the defeat and imprisonment of the ruler of Surāshtra, we find corroboration for it in the Siddh-Hema grammar of Hemachandra. In the two examples 'अरुणत् सिद्धराजोऽवन्तीन्' and 'अजयत् सिद्धः सौराष्ट्रान्' we find references to these two important events of J's reign. We can also infer from the uses of tenses that the conquest of Saurāshṭras must have taken place earlier than the siege of Avantis. Again in a verse attributed to Rāmachandra – a pupil of Hemachandra – by the P. C., Jayasiṃha is called 'Giridurgamalla' i. e. "Champion of Giridurga or Junāgadha" (p. 63).

The K. K., the P. P. S., and the P. C. – all mention this event in some detail. The bardic accounts of Soraṭha are full of it and have represented the whole episode as a tragic romance woven round the beautiful Rāṇakadevī whom Jayasimha loved, but whom Khengara of Jungadha managed to marry and who thus gave cause for a war which ended in Khengara's

destruction. The Sorathās (couplets) put into the mouth of Rāṇakadevī are full of poignant pathos, but it is a question whether they are useful as historical material. The existence of Rāṇakadevī herself is even doubtful.

From the K. K., we only learn that Jayasimha crushed the very powerful Khengāra of Surāshṭra in the battle as a lion kills an elephant (C. II. v. 25). The V. T. K. (p. 9) also gives the name as Khengārarāya; so does the P. P. S. (pp. 32, 54). But the P. C. gives the name as Navaghaṇa. Now from the accounts of the bards, it appears that when Jayasimha came to the throne Navaghaṇa who was a very powerful man was the ruler of Junagadha. Jayasiṃha had once defeated this Navaghaṇa on the border of Gujarata and Kathiawada and humiliated him. Khengara his successor was made to vow by his dying father that he would break the gates of Aṇahillapura, which he did when Jayasimha was engaged in Mālava. The immediate cause of war with Khengara, according to the bards, was Rāṇakadevī. *

* According to the P. P. S., it was Udayana of Cambay who killed Khengāra (pp. 32, 34). According to the same authority Udayana was killed in battle while fighting with Sāngaṇ Dodiāka. According to the Kathiawar Gazeteer, the Thanadar of Jayasimha was expelled and Noghana III seated on the throne (p. 444). According to the Pr. Cha. Udayana was mortally wounded while fighting under Kīrtipāla brother of Kumārapāla, who was sent to fight Navaghaṇa of Surāshṭra-maṇḍala. This Navaghaṇa must be Noghaṇa the third (Pr. Cha. p. 332.) See Saurāshṭra desano Itihāsa Part I by Bhagvanlal Sampatram, pp. 104 - 111, and the Gazeteer of the Bombay Presidency. Vol. VIII, Kathiawar, pp. 493 - 494.

According to the bardic accounts, Khengāra was killed in battle; but according to our inscription he was only imprisoned.

The name of Rāṇakadevī is given neither by the P. P. S. nor by the P. C. The P. P. S. gives the name as Sonaladevī, while the P. C. as Sunaladevī. The P. P. S. quotes eleven while the P. C. eight Apabhraṃsa verses, supposed to be uttered by Sonaladevī, after Khengāra met a hero's death in battle.

It is not known in which year this event took place. The B. G., on the basis of an inscription on Girinar of V. S. 1176 - A. D. 1120, thinks that Sajjana was a Governor of Surāshṭra by that time. There is, however, only one inscription of Jayasimha's time on Girināra that I am able to trace and that one gives no date and does not mention Sajjana. But from the V. T. K., we learn that, in V. S. 1185, Sajjana, as the Governor of the place, built a temple of Neminātha; while the P. C. tells us that Sajjana spent three years' revenue in building the temple. If the account of the P. C. is to be relied upon, we can say, that Sajjana was the Governor of Surāshṭra in V. S. 1181 - 82 A. D. 1125 - 26. * Surāshṭra might have been conquered before A. D. 1125 - 26.

Thus there is no direct evidence from which we can know the year in which Ra'Khangara was defeated and taken prisoner. The inscription in the Sodhalivāva of Mangarol in Kathiawar, however, gives some clue. It gives its date in two eras V. S. 1202 and Srī

* Noghana III died in 1140 A. D. (K. G. p. 494) If Kumārapāla's brother Kīrtipāla fought with this Naughana it must have been after V. S, 1199 = 1143 A. D.

Simha Samvat 32. No doubt, this Śrī Simha Samvat prevalent in Saurāshtra refers to the era inaugerated by Jayasimha to commemcrate some important event. We know of no other important event other than defeating the powerful king of Junagadha. If Simha era was intended to commemorate this event we can say that Khengara must have been defeated in the year V. S. 1170 = A. D. 1114.

Two other political events of Jayasimha's reign may be mentioned here: one of them is his march against Madanavarman of Mahobaka (in Bundelkhand). According to the K. K. the lord of Mahobaka under the pretext of hospitality gave him fine (II. 3). The P. P. S. and the Prabandharatnakośa also narrate this episode. But from an inscription found at Kalinjara we learn that Madanavarman defeated the king of Gujarata. It appears that the whole episode ended in a friendly alliance. *

From an inscription found at Talavada, we learn that Jayasimha defeated one Paramardi.

Pt. Oza identifies him with Paramardi of Kalyāṇa in the south who was known as Vikramāditya VI. +

Thus we find that by the year V. S. 1196 = A. D. 1140 Jayasimha's conquests were almost complete. Not only did Jayasimha consolidate the dominion which he inherited from his father, but he added Mālava which at that time included Mevāda as a part of its dominion. His was truly an empire in the proper sense of the word. For, in addition to Gujarata and

* N. P. P. Vol. IV p. 286 Pt. Oza's article on Jayasimha.

+ Ibid p. 286.

Surāshṭra proper, his sway extended beyond Ajmer in the north, to Cutch and Sindha in the N. W., Mevāda in the N. E. and Mālava in the east. In the south, Karṇa's authority extended beyond Navasari; while Jayasimha's authority extended as far as Kalyāna (in the Nizām's dominion). As we shall see this empire was further strengthened and extended by Jayasimha's successor Kumārapāla.

We saw that after conquering Mālava, he put Mahādeva as his Governor in Ujjayinī and Keṣava in Dadhipadra or Dohada. After defeating Sindhurāja of Lāṭa, Udayana seems to have been made a governor at Cambay (the P. P. S. p. 32). So also after imprisoning Khengāra, Jayasimha appointed Sajjana as the Governor of Surāshtra. It appears to be a feature of Jayasimha's policy that he generally annexed the country he coquered to his own dominion and that he appointed his own officers to govern them on his behalf. He was, one may say, a believer in the policy of 'thorough'. This is probably the meaning of a Prākṛta verse × quoted in the P. C. where Jayasimha is compared to a maker of wicker-work who after breaking all the royal bamboos (families) made one umbrella for the whole world (p. 75).

Jayasimha, however, did not impress his own generation merely as a conqueror. No doubt, the very first attribute with which the K. K. characterizes him is that of Jagajjayin - conqueror of the world; but other sources and especially the tradition show

× स जयउ कूडवरडो तिहूयणमज्झम्मि जेसलनरिन्दो ।
छित्तूण रायवंसे इक्कं छत्तं कयं जेण ॥

him to be a great builder of architectural works so much so that even to-day to the popular mind, Jayasimha is the builder of almost every Hindu architectural remain of some antiquity. As in his war, so in his building - ventures, tradition associates Barbaraka with him as his chief assistant.

There is a verse + quoted in the P. C., which tells us that Jayasimha did FOUR great things which no body could do. These four things are:-A Mahālaya (great temple referring to Rudra Mahālaya) a Mahāyatrā - (great pilgrimage to Someśvara on foot) a Mahāsaras (- great lake referring to the Sahasralinga lake) and a Mahāsthāna (a great place). We cannot definitely say what is referred to by Mahāsthāna; probably it referes to the great Dānaśālā built near the lake Sahasralinga - a sort of free boarding and lodging place for students.

The fifteenth canto of the D. K. is devoted to the description of these things.

Hemachandra tells us that in Siddhapura on the bank of the river Sarasvatī, which turns there to the east, Jayasimha built Rudra - Mahālaya (v. 15). Now we know that Rudra - Mahālaya was first built by Mūlarāja, and that much damage was done to it by Barbaraka. So Jayasimha must have repaired or rebuilt the whole temple in a style befitting the conqueror of Ujjayinī where was the famous temple of Mahākāla. It is possible to imagine the magnificence of the great Rudra - Mahālaya even from its ruins.

" The gigantic fragments " says Dr. Burgess,

+ महालयो महायात्रा महास्थानं महासरः ।
यत्कृतं सिद्धराजेन क्रियते तन्न केनचित् ॥

" That still remain, impress the beholder with admiration at the scale and grandeur of the conception....So far as can now be made out, it covered an oblong of about 230 feet by 300 feet, in the centre of which stood the temple - two or three storeys in height, with a Maṇḍapa 50 feet square inside having porches on the east, north and south sides and the shrine on the west. In or round the court, were eleven other shrines to the Rudras. The court was perhaps surrounded by small cells after the manner of some of the Jaina temples, with the principal entrance on the east and a ghāt or flight of steps down to the Sarasvatī river on that side. Of this splendid temple only a few magnificent fragments remain, the four pillars of the north porch, and five of the east porch to the Maṇḍapa-one being an engaged pillar inside the door, four pillars in the back of the Maṇḍapa, a beautiful toraṇa or Kīrtistambha - and one cell at the back of the court; also a number of pillars and doors of three other cells, possibly all in situation which have been turned into a mosque about 57 feet in length." *

We learn from the Upadeṣataranginī of Ratnamandira (cir. 15th cen. A D.) that Ṣāliga of Deṣalahara family repaired the temple-of Rudra Mahālaya and ' again gave youth to the fame of Ṣrī Jayasimhadeva.'

The P. C. tells us that this Rudramahākālaprāsāda was twenty - three hands in measurement. This means that the garbhagṛha - or the inner hall in which the principal image was seated - was twentythree hands in height. The other parts of the temple must have

* Burgess and Cousens Archeological Survey : Northern Gujarat. pp. 59 - 60. See also the plate facing p. 64.

been in proportion to this central building. We learn from it also that there were 'statues of Aṣvapatis (– Masters of Horses –), Gajapatis (Masters of Elephants,) Narapatis – (Masters of Men,) and that in front of these statues was the statue of Jayasimha himself with his hands folded in the pose of a devotee before Ṣiva praying that the temple may never suffer destruction.' When the flag was hoisted on the Rudramahākālaprāsāda the flags from the Jaina temples were lowered (p. 61).

A composition in the Apabhramṣa of the poet Gadda describing the Rudra-Mahālaya is quoted in the Upadeṣatarangiṇī of Ratnamandira mentioned above. The text of the poem is not correctly printed but from the last line it appears that the poem was addressed to Jayasimha Chakravarti personally; so presumably it must be a contemporary record. From it, we learn, 'there were 1444 'varas' (?) + 1700 pillars, 1800 pūttalis set with jewels and rubies and garments of silver, thirty thousand flag – staffs, and 10,000 golden kalaṣas and fifty – six kodi (which may mean either 56 crores or 56 twenties) images of horses and elephants.' Says the poet Gadda, the temple delights gods and men. Oh Chakravartin Jayasimha! your fame shines in this famous place!' (pp. 64 – 65). There are other ballads in old Gujarati giving different figures for pillars etc.

We learn from an old unpublished prabandha that the minister Āliga was appointed to look after the

+ The meaning of this word is not clear. It might refer to vārānganās-dancing damsels. Or there might be some mistake in the reading.

building of the temple, that Aliga himself built a Chaturmukha-temple known as Rājavihāra at his own expense in Siddhapura, and that the king being pleased with him granted him several villages in V. S. 1198 = A. D. 1142. If Jayasimha commenced the rebuilding of Rudra-Mahālaya after his conquest of Mālava in 1192-A. D. 1136, we can say, it took him six years to complete the work-not too long a time, looking to the gigantic work.+

The D. K. tells us in the next verse (16) that Jayasimha built at the same place a temple of the last Arhat, and put certain Brāhmaṇas to look after it. This means that Jayasimha built a temple of Mahāvīra in Siddhapura. This is the first reference in the D. K. - to something specifically Jaina. In the next verse (17) we are told that the king properly honoured the Ārhata Samgha. It is difficult to reconcile this contemporary reference with the P. C.'s account that flags were removed from the Jaina temples.

After this Hemachandra describes the second great thing that Jayasimha did - his pilgrimage to Somanātha on foot (v. 18-36). The description of the pilgrimage is interesting from many points of view, but we cannot go into its details here. × In Devapattana Jayasimha was received by Gaṇḍa who was in charge

+ Ṣāliga who repaired the temple was a brother to the famous Samarāsā. They were contemporaries of Allauddin Khilaji; both the brothers were important and influential personages in the time of Islamic rule in Aṇahillapura.

+We learn from verse 26 that the names of the three of Jayasimha's queens were Kuntī, Avantī and Kurū. Probably these are not their proper names, but their names after the provinces of their birth.

of the city. The king worships Ṣiva who appears to him in person and blesses him " Be thou now Siddhirāt by Suvarṇa-siddhi through which you have removed the indebtedness of the earth "-v. 50. This is the explanation of the word Siddhirāja given by Hemachandra.

The king requests the god to grant him a son, but Ṣambhu touching his hairy head tells him " your brother Tribhuvanapāla's son Kumārapāla will be king after you " and disappears (v. 54-56).

From Somanātha, Jayasimha goes to Raivataka or Girinar mountain and there pays his respects to Nemi the twenty-second Jaina Tīrthankāra (vs. 63-88). Then he granted Simhapura and other villages to Brāhmaṇas (v. 97-98) and returned to his capital (v. 100). Then comes the description of the sacrifices he performed and we are told that whenever doubts arose as to certain rituals, Jayasimha himself removed them (108). That showed how learned he was (vs. 104-113) !

After these Ishta - Karmans comes the great Pūrta - the construction of the Great Lake (114). This was the third great thing that he did which others can never do.

Near the banks of the lake, he built Satraṣālas for Brāhmaṇas (115). These Satraṣālas were congested with students coming there for food (116). On the bank of the lake he built 1008 temples of Ṣambhu (117) and 108 temples of goddesses. Near the same lake, he built a temple of Daṣāvatāra (that is a temple containing images of the ten incarnations of Vishṇu, v. 119). There also he built maṭhas (according to the commentator, residencies for students and others) to please professors of different departments of learning. (11).

He built these temples to gods as if he was raising big monuments to his fame (123).

This great lake of Jayasimha Siddharāja known as Siddhasara or Siddhasāgara or more popularly as Sahasralinga-talāva, with its 1008 Ṣiva temples and 108 Devī temples and numerous other fanes and with its Kīrtistambha shining like a silvery column, must have made the surroundings of Aṇahillapura-pattana magnificent. Satraṣālās and Maṭhas providing for various departments of learning must have made the area something like a University-suburb. The surrounding wood-land beauty, with its touch of nature, must have made it a thing to tickle the imagination. From the few descriptions that have survived, we can say that many contemporary and later poets must have sung the sacred majesty of the beautiful lake. A praṣasti, by Ṣrīpāla, the poet-laureate of Jayasimha's court, was inscribed on the Kīrtistambha - a slab of which has been discovered.

The description in the K. K. gives a graphic picture of the city and the lakes as they appeared after one or two generations. *

Coming to the great personages of the times, it is the Queen - Mother Mayaṇallā or Minaldevī as she is known to Gujarat, who first commands our attention. This princess of Karṇātaka who for sheer love went all the way to Gujarata to marry its king Karṇa has been well described by Hemachandra. The life-long intense attachment of this royal couple which was not

* For a detailed accout see Saraswati Purāṇa and the excellent monograph on Siddhasara by Mr. Kanaiyalal B. Dave.

blessed with an offspring for a long time appears to have touched the imagination of Hemachandra.

Mayaṇallā after the death of her husband spent her life in a religious manner - going to pilgrimages and building works of public utility. Whether she took any part in the affairs of the state-we have no evidence to judge. According to the P. C., as we saw, she got the pilgrim-tax of Somanātha removed through her son. But this was a religious act, surely not a service to the state. Her holiness is particularly emphasised by the story of the 'Jar of Sin' in the P. C.

It appears Jayasimha was greately attached to his mother. When, after conquering Mālava, on his return to Aṇahillapura, he was being congratulated with Mangala verses, he seems to have been poignantly reminded of his mother who was then dead. The sentiment that Jayasimha must have given vent to is expressed in a verse quoted by the Prabandhkoṣa, as being uttered by the king. "Let no woman give birth to a son like this (referring to himself) whose luck bore its greatest fruit after the death of his mother!"+

Two lakes - one at Viramgama and the other at Dholka-named after her have survived.

Of the other great political figures of Jayasimha's reign, we may mention Sampatkara or Santu, Munjāla, Āsvāka, Dādāka, Mahādeva, Keṣava, and Udayana.

We have already referred to Sampatkara as the chief minister in the time of Karṇa. He was probably a native of Baroda. His father's name was Varṇāg

---

मा स्म सिमन्तिनी कापि जनयेत् सुतमीदृशम् ।
बृहद् भाग्यफलं यस्य मृतमातुरनन्तरम् ॥

P. K. p. 115.

and mother's name was Sampūrī. In the begining, he was a governor of Lāṭa in Bhṛgukachha. Being a great statesman, he was made the chief minister by Karṇa. The Karṇasundarī of Bilhaṇa was acted in his temple. His engrossment in state affairs, – so much so that he has no time to talk to his children or his newly married wives – his proficiency in state – craft, and his success in political affairs are specially mentioned by Bilhaṇa. He is described as surpassing even famous ministers like Yauganadharāyaṇa of the past. Gujarat's alliance with the southern Kadamba family of Karnatak through marriage was probably the result of his policy. He had sent an army under the General Sāchchika to fight the Sultan of Gajni whom it defeated on the banks of the Sindhu.

When Madanavarman, the maternal uncle of Karṇa, grew turbulent in Aṇahillapura, Sampatakara managed to get him killed in a fracas of soldiers.

We have seen how Sampatakara managed to send away Naravarman of Mālava who attacked Aṇahillapura in the absence of Jayasimha. The P. C. tells us that when Jayasimha was returning from one of his early expeditions against Mālava Samtu cleared the way for the king by suppressing the turbulent Bhillas (p. 75).

It appears, however, the old minister who had trained young Jayasimha for kingship was growing distasteful to the young ambititious monarch who once insulted him. Sampatakara resigned his post and left Gujarata for Mālava. We know from the colophon of V. S. 1179–A. D. 1123 that he was minister till then, but in V. S. 1180–A.D. 1124 Āṣuka was minister. So he must have resigned about that time. He, however, remained

steadfast in loyalty to his king. Jayasimha came to know of this and repented of his conduct with the old minister and called him back. When Sampatakara was returning to Gujarata, he died on the way at a place called Āhaḍa on the border line of Mevāḍa and Mālava, the original site of Udaipur.

Mūnjāla, we learn from a colophon of a ms., was a mahāmātya great minister of Karṇa in V. S. 1146–A. D. 1090. The P. C. tells us that Mūnjāla managed to substitute Mayaṇallā in place of a low-born woman whom Karṇa loved. But this whole episode is, as we saw, without any historical foundation. The second reference to Mūnjāla in the P. C. informs us that when Jayasimha could not take Dhārā, Mūnjāla, on the strength of his secret information, asked Jayasimha to attack by the southern gate. Again it was at the suggestion of Mūnjāla that a wooden sword was given instead of a real sword to Yaṣovarman in the triumphal march when he was seated behind Jayasimha. If Munjāla lived so long as to do all these things, he must have been very old indeed !

From V. S. 1179–80–A. D. 1123–24, Āsvāka or Āṣuka seems to have occupied the position of one of the chief ministers. From the M.K.C., we learn that Mahattara Gāngila was the prime minister in V. S. 1181–A. D. 1125.

We know from the two inscriptions of V. S. 1192–A. D. 1136 that Dādāka was the prime minister at Aṇahillapura. But nothing more is known about this Nāgara prime minister at the time of the great Mālava victory. His son Mahādeva was the Governor of Mālava.

In the inscription of V. S. 1193 Ambāprasāda is referred to as the Mahāmātya and in charge of–Vyayakaraṇa – treasury.

From the inscription of V. S. 1196–A. D. 1140, we learn that Keṣava was a general of the army and the Governor of the Dohada district. He was a Vaishṇava and built the temple of Goga Nārāyaṇa at Dadhipadra or Dohada in memory of his mother.

Udayana was a Governor of Stambhatirtha. We shall speak of him later on.

What impression Jayasimha and his capital Aṇahillapura created upon a foreigner, we gather from the following account of the geographer Al - Idrisi who visited his court (C. H. I. Vol. III 517).

" The city of Nahrvala is governed by a great prince called the Balhara. He has troops of elephants, worships Buddha, wears a gold crown and dresses in rich robes. He generally rides a horse, especially once a week, when, with a hundred women richly clothed with gold and silver rings on their hands and feet, their hair in braids, he gives himself up to games and show-fights. The ministers and commanders only go with the king on occasion of battle. The chief strength of the king lies in the elephants. His title Balhara means the king of kings. The city is frequented by a great number of Musalman merchants who resort to it in business. They are well received by the king and his officers and find protection and security. The Indians by nature are inclined to justice. Their good faith, loyalty and faithfulness are so well known that every one hears that their country is prosperous. As a proof of their love of honesty, if a creditor is anxious to receive a debt, he has only to draw a line round his debtor who will not move till he has satisfied his creditor or the debt is paid. The people eat grain

and vegetables and animals that die a natural death. They never take away animal life. They have a great respect for cattle and bury them when they die; when they get past work, they feed them."

How equitably Jayasimha behaved with Mussalmans is seen from the report of an incident in Khambhat by Muhammed Ufi in his Jame-ul-Hikayata +

The following story of the gram-seller from the P. C. shows what tales - real or unreal - had formed round the popular king. "Once the king was witnessing a play at night in a temple known as Karṇamerūprāsāda. At the time a gram-seller - just a bania - put his hand on the king's shoulder. The king got interested in the bania's jolly manner. (Presumably this has reference to the bania's jolly and friendly remarks as the play was proceeding). The king offered him a beetle-leaf with camphor which the latter took with great delight. After the play was over, the king, through his men, inquired of his whereabouts and sent for him in the morning to go to his court. The king complained that, his neck was aching on account of the weight of the bania's hand. The bania realized the whole thing, but answered with his ready-wit: "Your Majesty! you carry the burden of the whole earth on your shoulder, and even then it does not feel it; how can it feel the pain of the burden of a bania's hand - just like the blade of a grass?" The king was pleased with the man's sense of propriety and gave him handsome reward" (pp. 70-71).

From the Vāgbhaṭalamkāra and a verse of Ṣrīpāla quoted under the name of Kavirāja by Somaprabha.

+ N. P. P. Vol. IX p. 291.

chāraya in his commentary on his Ṣatāratha Kāvya, we learn that Jayasimha's banner bore the sign of a red-crested cock on it (V. L. Pari. 4. v. 81 and Introduction to the K. Pra. p. 11.)*

Yaṣahpaṭaha was his favourite elephant who was killed while breaking open the gates of Dhārā. From the Vāgbhaṭālamkāra, we learn that Jayasimha had also another elephant named Ṣrī Kalaṣa whom the author mentions as one of the three jewels of the world – the other two being the city of Anahillapāṭaka and the son of the king Karna, i. e. Jayasimha (C. IV. v. 132).×

Of the literary figures and the learned assembly of Jayasimha, I shall speak when we come to describe Hemachandra's life.

The last days of Jayasimha are described in the

---

* इन्द्रः स एष यदि किं न सहस्रमक्ष्णां
लक्ष्मीपतिर्यदि कथं न चतुर्भुजोऽसौ ।
आः स्यन्दनध्वजधृतोद्धुरताम्रचूडः
श्रीकर्णदेवनृपसूनुरयं रणाग्रे ॥

रे भूपाः कविराज एष भवतो जल्पत्युदञ्चद्भुजः
पूज्या वध्वरणायुधा परममी युष्मत्कुले देवताः ।
यद् युद्धोत्सवदर्शनैकरसिकः श्रीताम्रचूडध्वजो
देवः पश्यत नाधुना परि...यत्येकातपत्रां महीम् ॥

एकाङ्गवीरतिलको भुवनैकमल्लः
सिद्धाधिपः परमसाहसिकप्रकाण्डः ।
दर्पान्धबर्बरकजिष्णुरवन्तिनाथ–
इत्यूर्जितैर्जयति नामभिरेव देवः ॥

Both these verses are attributed to Kavirāja that is Ṣrīpāla by Somaprabha. (See Introduction Ku. Pra. p. 11).

× अणहिल्लपाटकं पुरमवनिपतिः कर्णदेवनृपसूनुः ।
श्रीकलशनामधेयः करी च रत्नानि जगतीह ॥

last two verses of the 15th canto of the D. K.. Jayasimha remembering the words of the god Somanātha that Kumārapāla was to succeed him after his death, tried for self-realisation. Thinking of Parameṣṭhins, he went to the city of Indra + (vs. 123-24.)

According to the P. C., Jayasimha's reign lasted up to the beginning of the year V. S. 1199-A. D. 1143. In a colophon of Mārgasirsha of 1199, we find Kumārapala regining in Aṇahillapura. So Jayasimha must have died in the beginning of Kārtika of V. S. 1199. According to the P. P. S. after the death of Jayasimha, his sandals reigned for eighteen days (p. 45). This shows that it took some time before the new king was elected.

15

Of the reign of Kumārapāla, we have more than twenty-three inscriptions, two of them on copper-plates and the remaining on stone. Of these, two stone-inscriptions - one of V. S. 1207 - A. D. 1151 and the other of V. S. 1208-A. D. 1152 and one copper-plate grant, of V. S. 1212-A. D. 1156, are directly connected with Kumārapāla, while the others refer to him as the reigning sovereign.

As to the literary material, there are many Jaina works dealing with Kumārapāla. We shall mention

+ We see that there is a significant difference here in describing the succession. The usual procedure of the reigning king calling his successor to accpt the throne, and the successor first refusing and then accepting it is omitted here. The ugly facts of Kumarapala's succession Hemachandra intentionally omits. This trait of Hemachandra is worth keeping in mind when utilizing the D. K. for historical purposes: it is that rather than narrate false accounts better omit the incidents altogether.

only three contemporary works. These are, in addition to the remaining part of the S. D. K., the Prākṛta Dvyāṣraya or the Kumārapālacharita of Hemachandra, the play called Moharājaparājaya and the Kumārapāla-pratibodha of Somaprabhāchārya. Some twenty verses in the Chhandonuṣāsana, about 105 verses in the Deṣīnāmamālā and a few verses in the Triṣashṭiṣalākā-purushacharita and Pariṣishṭaparva, have Kumārapāla for their subject. Hemachandra is the author of these works.

The Kumārapālaprabandha of Jinamandana has been, up till now, largely drawn upon by scholars.

As we inferred from the D. K. the succession of Kumārapāla to Jayasimha's throne was not in the usual manner. We have no direct contemporary evidence explaining why Jayasimha was averse to the succession of Kumārapāla. According to the D. K. (C. IX v. 70-77) Bhīma I had a son named Kshemarāja who was older than Karṇa. He was asked to accept the crown which he being of a religious temper refused. Karṇa, therefore, mounted the throne and Kshemarāja led a religious life in Dadhisthalī on the Sarasvatī. Kshemarāja had a son named Devaprasāda.

When Karṇa gave his throne to Jayasimha, he asked him to be kind to his brother's son Devaprasāda. Devaprasāda put his son Tribhuvanapāla under the care of Jayasimha and died with Karṇa on the Sarasvatī (D. K. C. X. v. 110 - 115). Jayasimha looked upon Tribhuvanapāla as his own son (X. v. 116). Kumārapāla was a son of this Tribhuvanapāla. The same geneology is given in an unpublished inscription of Chitodagadha quoted by Pt. Oza in his Rajputāne -

ka - Itihāsa (Vol. I, pp. 218 - 19). The geneology of Kumārapāla given by the K. Pratibodha also agrees with this.

Thus Kumārapāla belonged to the senior line of the family and was fully entitled to the throne. We find that the D. K. generally refers to K. as Bhaimi - (that is - a descendent of Bhīma -) as if, thereby, emphasing his rightful claim to the throne. *

* The P. C. however, tells a different tale. According to it Bhīma married a hetaera named Bakulādevī or Chaulādevī who was very faithful to him, and had a son by her named Haripāla. This Haripala had a son named Tribhuvanapāla whose son was Kumārapāla. Jayasimha could not bear that a kinsman who, on mother's side, was low-born should succeed him. So he was always seeking for an opportunity to kill Kumārapāla (p. 77).

This account of the P. C. gives a credible explanation of Jayasimha's hostile attitude to Kumārapāla, but differs in its geneology from contemporary accounts and flatly contradicts the D. K. according to which, Kshemarāja was fully legible for the throne. We do not know what was the authority of the P. C. for giving such a humiliating origin to a king, who according to the Jaina sources, was a Parama-Ārhata - a great Jaina king. As it is, we cannot accept it in face of contemporary authorities. For another and a more probable explanation see p. CCI.

The Kumārapāla-prabandha of Jinamaṇḍana gives the same geneology. It gives also additional information about the other relatives of Kumārapāla. The name of the mother of Kumārāpla was Kāśmirādevī. She had three sons Kumārapāla, Mahīpāla and Kīrtipāla. She had two daughters named Premaladevī and Devaladevī. The first was married to Kṛshṇadeva, the master of Śrī Jayasimhadeva's Horse and the second to Arṇorāja, ruler of Śākambhari. Kumarapāla was married by his parents to one Bhopaloa or Bhūpaladevi (p. 18). We learn from the Pra, Cha. (p. 319. v. 392) that this Bhūpāladevī accompanied her husband in his wandering.

The account of the early part of Kumārapāla's life is to be gathered from the Prabandhas. His early travels are, however, referred to by Yaśahpāla – a contemporary of Kumārapāla–in his play the Moharāja-parājaya (Act I, 28).

According to the P. P. S. when Kumārapāla left Aṇahillapura, through fear of murder, he was about twenty years old. He travelled in various parts of India and made pilgrimage to Kedāranātha seven times. He had to travel incognito for thirty years. He proceeded to Aṇahillapura when he heard of Jayasimha's death in the shop of a shoemaker in Ujjayiṇī (P. P. S. p. 38).

While thus running about to save his life, he was helped by many people. Once when Kumārapāla happened to be in Stambhatīrtha (Cambay), his future kingship was forecast by Hemachandra in presence of Udayana who was then the Governor at Stambhatīrtha. When Kumārapāla could not believe in such an impossible future Hemachandra wrote down the exact date of his coronation as Sam. 1199 Kārtika Vadi 2 Sunday, and gave one copy to Kumārapāla, and another to Udayaṇa for verification. When Kumārapāla was pursued by the soldiers of Jayasimha, he was helped in various ways by Hemachandra; though according to the account of the Pr. Cha. Udayaṇa out of his loyalty to Jayasimha or more probably fear, refused to give quarter to Kumārapāla (Pr. cha. 322 vs. 443 – 444).

Kumārapāla got the throne through the help of his sister's husband. His name is given as Kānhaḍa-deva in the P. C. (p. 78).

Somaprrbhasūrī – a contemporary of Kumārapāla,

gives the following account of his accession to the throne. 'When Jayasimha went to heaven to make friends with the king of gods this earth became sad as lotuses do when the sun sets. Then the ministers, who surpassed the Guru of gods - Bṛhaspati - in intelligence, seeing the kingdom without a protector began to converse like this.' (Then follows the geneology of Kumārapāla from Bhīma I to which we have referred). 'His (Tribhuvanapāla's) son named Kumārapāla is bright, of a pleasant face and like Indra in splendour. He is liberal, brave, and a protector of the helpless. He is endowed with all royal qualities, therefore let us make a king of him; away with others possessing no merits. Thus consulting with one another, and seeking unanimity with palmists, astrologers etc., Kumārapāla was established on the throne by the ministers. Then the whole world became satisfied.' (P. 5 Ku. Prati. G. O. S.)

According to the P. C., Kumārapāla was about fifty years old when he mounted the throne. This he did in V. S. 1199 which is corroborated, as we saw, by a colophon also. We can put Kumārapāla's birth in the year V. S. 1149, one year before Jayasimha came to the throne. Perhaps there was not much difference of age between the uncle and the nephew and as Kumārapāla was a legitimate rival to the throne Jayasimha might have become jealous of him.

According to the P. C., Kumārapāla reigned from V. S. 1199 to V. S. 1230–A. D. 1143–1174 (pp. 95–96).

The first few years of Kumārapāla's reign were very troublesome. But he, being a man of mature age and much experience, gathered from a wandering

26

life full of hardships, soon restored order within his kingdom, consolidated his power and extended his empire. It was in his reign that Gurjaradeṣa reached its zenith. Immediately after him its decline began.

The first man to trouble him was his brother-in-law, who was instrumental in getting him the throne. He, however, did not like that Kumārapāla should not only reign but rule and so tried to belittle him publicly. Kumārapāla gave him warning which he did not heed; so he got him severely beaten by his athlets. Thus, according to the P. C., he set a lesson for other Sāmantas who understood that the king was not to be taken lightly (p. 71).

The earliest inscription of his reign, as yet, discovered is of the year V. S. 1202-A. D. 1146 in the step-well of Sodhalivava of Mangrol of the king Mūluka of Gohila dynasty a chief subordinate to Kumārapāla. From this we learn that when Ṣrī Siddharāja died, Kumārapāla 'suddenly occupied the throne of Jayasimha.' This phrase is no doubt significant.

The inscription begins with a beautiful prayer to Ṣiva and after referring to Kumārapāla's accession to the throne goes on to inform us that one Somarāja of Guhila dynasty built a small temple in the name of his father Sāhāra in the jagatī or compound of Somanātha. This inscription provides for the expenses of the worship of Ṣrī Sāhāreṣvara. The grantor is Ṣrī Mūluka. This praṣasti is composed by Parama Pāṣupatāchārya, - Mahāpaṇḍita Ṣrī Pra - Sarvvajṇa. In addition to the V. S. 1202, it gives Ṣrī Simha Samvat 32. This Samvat, no doubt, refers to the era started by Jayasimha probably to commemorate the victory over Ra'Khengāra.

An inscription dated V. S. 1205–A. D. 1149 of Paramāra Someṣvara a subordinate chief of Kumārapāla has been discovered in a temple of Ṣiva in Kirādu in Jodhpur State.

The Chitodagadha inscription of Kumārapāla is dated V. S. 1207–A. D. 1151. This inscription is a long praṣasti of 28 verses. It commemorates the granting of a village for the worship of Hara to the temple known as Samiddheṣvara. It also mentions the granting of an oil mill for the purpose of lighting the temple by the Daṇḍanāyaka – the General–Sajjana. The temple was in charge of the Ṣaiva nun Gaurīdevī a disciple of Bhaṭṭārikā Uttamādevī. The praṣasti is composed by the poet Ṣrī Rāmakīrtti a disciple of Srī Jayakīrtti and the head of the Digambara sect. The praṣasti is written in excellent poetic style.

This inscription mentions the Chālukya dynasty in general terms, refers to Mūlarāja and Siddharāja and then describes Kumārapāla. We learn from it that after defeating the lord of Ṣākambhari and leaving his big army encamped in a village named Ṣālipura Kumārapāla went to Chitrakūta, i. e. Chitoda to see its beauty. The poet then describes Chitrakūṭa and the temple of Samiddheṣvara.

We learn from this inscription that before the year V. S. 1207 i. e. before the eighth year of his reign Kumārapāla defeated Arṇorāja the king of Sapādalaksha.

This is the first event of Kumārapāla's reign that the D. K. narrates at great length in three cantos XVI, XVII and XVIII.

We are told in the sixteenth Canto that

'Kumārapāla having come adorned the throne of his forefathers' (v. 1). Seeing the energy and vigilance of their sovereign neighbouring chieftains like those of Māheyas (according to the commentary ruler of Godraha or Godhra) and Rāshṭriyas (?) waited upon him (v. 6). Then we are informed that suddenly Anna (Ānāka= Arṇorāja) rose against Kumārapāla. (The commentary explains by saying that ' after the death of Jayasimha seeing that Kumārapāla being a new king would be weak, Ānna opposed him unexpectedly, unexpectedly because there was no cause.) Not only Ānna rose against him, but 'this king of the north (sapādalaksha and other countries) instigated Ballāla the king of the east (i. e. Mālava) to attack the rear of the king of the west (i. e. Kumārapāla.) when he would be engaged in fighting Ānna ' (v. 8). Not only that, Ānna got other kings also to help him (9). A secret emissary of Kumārapāla comes and informs him that ' within a day Ānna would be attacking the boundary of his kingdom ' (v. 13). Some of Kumārpāla's former allies, including Chāhaḍa × the head of the elephant section of his army, had joined the enemy (14–16). The king of Gonarda that is Ballāla who was Kumārapāla's vassal (Rājakīya) had also joined the enemy (17). ' The king curbing his anger considered the whole situation calmly and resolved upon his strategy. He sent his general, according to the commentary, a Brāhamaṇa named Kakka against Ballāla and himself marched against Ānna ' (22–23).

× This Chāhaḍa is different from a son of Udayana of that name. This treacherous Chāhaḍa is referred to as Tyāgabhata by Yaśahpāla in his Moharājaparājaya.

Kumārapāla, however, proceeded in such a way as to give no clue to his purpose. (v. 26). He came to Ābu whose king Vikramasimha was his vassal. Vikramsimha welcomes Kumārapāla and describes Mount Abu and his territory (vs. 35-70).

In this excellent description we find mention made of Achaleṣvara temple, Adinātha temple – presumably the one built by Vimala-and the fair held in honour of Ṣrī Mātā. The river Banas is also referred to. The seventeenth canto is devoted to the descriptions of flower-gathering, bathing, music, dancing, play-acting, putting on clothes of Kusumbha colour, drinking, etc. (XVII-35, 35-75, 76-138).

The eighteenth canto is devoted to the description of the battle between the armies, and the personal combat between Ānna and Kumārapāla (Bhaimi) (v. 101-102). The valour of both of them is admired and their combat is compared to that of Arjuna and Karṇa (101-102). When, however, Anna fell down being wounded by Kumārapāla's iron arrow (103), Kumārapāla did not take the advantage and kill him (104). The army of the enemy was routed (105).

The nineteenth canto opens with Kumārapāla searching for the dead heroes lying on the battle-field (1). A peace-messenger from Ānna comes and praises Kumārapāla's Kshātra Dharma in not taking an undue advantage when Ānna was wounded (4). An offer to continue the same relations as were with Jayasimha is made and accepted. As a token of alliance, Ānna's daughter named Jahlaṇā is offered in marriage; Kumārapāla accepts the offer but requests

that the marriage should take place in Aṇahillapura - (his capital 34).

It must have been after his victory over Anna or Arṇorāja that Kumārapāla went to Chitodagadha and made the grant that is referred to in the inscription of V. S. 1207 already discussed. Kumārapāla must have returned to his capital after this semi-military and semi-religious tour to Chitradurga, to which place he is mentioned as going to see its natural beauty.

Verses 40-90 of the nineteenth canto are devoted to the description of the marriage-festival which is very interesting as throwing good light on social customs and manners of the times which in many respects are similar to those of the modern times in Gujarāta.

As the marriage-ceremony was reaching completion a messenger from the General appointed in Mālava (v. 95) comes and informs Kumārapāla of the victory of his "Gurjara-Brahma-Senanī" (that is the Brāhmaṇa General of Gujarata) over Mālava. The different stages of the fight are described by the messenger. In the first stage two of Kumārapāla's vassals Vijaya ane Krshṇaka * prove treacherous and join the enemy (v. 98). The morale of the army is spoiled and the army of Kumārapāla recedes in the first stages. His General exhorts his soldiers : " Fie upon your Hasti-varchas that was so much praised by my king ! " (v. 106). The last stage of the fight is also described. Ballāla approaches the General ' breaking through

* We do not know who this Vijaya and Kṛshaṇaka were. Was this Krshaṇāka the same as Kumārapāla's brother-in-law of that name ?

hundred rows of soldiers which were impregnable like ramparts of wood and stone and which could not be pierced through even by two days' efforts (v. 120)'. The General again exhorts his soldiers to fight for their life (v. 121-122). The soldiers, arranging themselves in the shape of 'two-boat,' attacked the enemy whose army was in the shape of a half-boat the other half being destroyed (v. 124). That hero of Avanti whose driver of elephant was killed, was thrown down from his elephant by a group of five kings in the presence of the 'Gurjara-Brahma General' (v. 126). Ballāla was, however, 'killed by some wicked Brāhmaṇas before the General could stop it through some great Brāhmaṇas' (v. 126).

The messenger was properly rewarded for the welcome news of victory.

Then the king went to his palace with his bride 'people looking at him from the shops of eatables.' Then the mother-in-law and the Purohita who had accompanied the bride returned to their place (133). Kumārapāla ruled well. (135-137).

In this description of the D. K., we get an account of two wars fought by Kumārapāla in the early part of his reign, that is before V. S. 1207-A. D. 1151. We learn that Vikramasimha was a vassal of Kumārapāla whom he invited to be his guest for some time at Ābu. Now, from an inscription of V. S. 1202 * = A. D. 1146 of Ajārigama, we learn that in that year Yaṣodhavala was reigning in Ābu; so Vikramsimha must have died by that time. From this we can infer that Kumārapāla must have been compelled to march against Ānna in

* See Pt. Oza's Raj. Itihasa pp. 175-76.

V. S. 1201 in the third year of his reign. We cannot say exactly when the final battle was fought. It is likely that this war must have lasted for a number of years, and Kumārapāla must have got his decisive victory somewhere about V. S. 1207, or a little earlier; for we learn from this inscription of V. S. 1207 that he encamped his army in the village of Ṣalipura and went personally to Chitrakūṭa. We also learn from it that his General Sajjana accompanied him to Chitrakūṭa.

The other war – that with Mālava – also must have been finally won by this time – that is V. S. 1207. In the Vadanagara praṣasti of V. S. 1208, the king of Mālava is represented as killed.

We learn from the praṣasti of V. S. 1287–A. D. 1231, in the temple of Tejahapāla that Yaṣodhavala seeing that Ballāla, ruler of Mālava was opposing Kumārapāla, immediately killed him (Prcahina Jaina Lekhasangraha by Muni Jinavijayaji p. 79). This shows that in the fight with Ballāla, Yaṣodhavala was Kumārapāla's ally and must have actually gone to fight with him. He might have been one of those five kings who threw Ballāla down from his elephant. The name of this Ballāla, however, is not mentioned in any of the inscriptions of Mālava *. This means that he was some subordinate chieftain, and this rising against Kumārapāla was possibly the act of some of these chieftains of Mālava. This inference is corroborated by the D. K. where Ballāla is called Gonardiya (XVI v. 17) which according to the commentator means that Ballala was a native of Gonarda, a town

* Pt. Oza's Raj. Itihaṣa p., 176.

in Avanti (that is Mālava). His co-conspirators are mentioned in the twentysecond verse.

We have an inscription of this Mahāmaṇḍaleṣvara Yaṣodhavala dated 1207 at Abu.

Of the year V. S. 1208-A. D. 1152 we have the famous praṣasti - inscription of Vaḍanagara which we have been utilizing as an important source of Gujarata history. This prasasti consists of thirty verses and a line in prose giving the date and the name of the engraver. The praṣasti begins with Om Namah Ṣivāya. The first verse praises the 'Ichchhāṣakti' or 'Will of God'. Verses 2-3 describe the mythical origin of Chālukya dynasty. From 4 to 14, the kings of this dynasty from Mūlarāja to Jayasimha are described. Verses 15 to 19 are devoted to Kumārapāla. The wounding of Arṇorāja is described in terms similar to those of the D. K.

In verse 15, Kumārapāla is described as making the goddess Chaṇḍi intoxicated with the blood of the king Arṇorāja who was wounded in chest by his arrows, reside in his arm, and, as satisfying the greed of the goddess for lotuses by hanging a lotus in the form of the head of the lord of Mālava. The same thing is repeated in verse 17.

Verses 20 - 24 describe the Nagara or Vadanagara and verses 25 - 30 describe the building of a fortifying wall round the city. The building-operations of the wall must have begun earlier as it was complete in V. S. 1208.

In verse 30, we learn that the author of this praṣasti was 'the king of poets-Ṣrīpāla who could compose a great work in a day and who was accepted as a brother by Ṣrī Siddharāja.' This is the same

Ṣrīpāla as wrote the praṣasti of the Sahasralinga Lake of Jayasimha. The inscription was engraved by Nāgara Brāhmaṇa Pandita Vālaṇa on Thursday the second of the bright half of the month of Āṣvina of the year V. S. 1208.

This inscription indicates that by V. S. 1208 -A. D. 1152 Kumārapāla was firmly established. In it he is represented as one who got his kingdom through the favour of Someṣvara, one whose work of killing the enemies was accomplished by goddesses, and so one whose army was just a thing of play (v. 18).

Like Aṣoka, Kumārapāla, after the bloody wars of the early part of his reign, appears to have turned his mind to non - violence towards animals. For, we find, in the D. K. that Hemachandra, after narrating his wars with Ānna and Ballāla, his marriage with Jalhaṇā and the safety and security in his kingdom (XX v. 1 - 2), describes Kumārapāla's efforts in spreading the doctrine of non - violence towards animals. A poor villager on an auspicious day was driving some goats to a slaughter house. Kumārapāla accosted him and was very much affected by what he heard from him (v. 10 - 20). He proclaimed " Amāri " or non - killing of animals (v. 22 - 23). Thenceforth sacrifice of animals for religious purposes was stopped (v. 20). " Out of consideration for Kumārapāla's words sages like Dakshiṇa Bhārgava sacrificed barley in their dīrgha - satras (or great sacrifices) " (v. 30). Hunting was also stopped (31 - 34). +

+That this was the result of Hemachandra's teachings, we learn from H's own words in the praṣasti of the Tripurusha-Ṣalākāpurushacharita.

The influence of this promulgation of Amāri was felt even in states subordinate to Kumārapāla. We have an inscription of Mahārāja Alhaṇadeva of Kirata or Kiraḍu in Māravāda dated 1209-A. D. 1153 - Māgha vadi 14 Saturday, granting 'Abhaya' that is safety to animals on the Ṣīvarātri and on the eigth, eleventh and the fourteenth days of every half of the month in three cities. Anybody breaking the order of Amāri - or non - killing - was liable to a fine of five drammas. This proclamation is countersigned by Ṣrī Kalhaṇa son of Alhaṇa. It was written by the Mahārājaputra Sāndhi vigrahika Ṭhakkura Kheläditya. This 'grant of safety was caused by Pūtiga and Sāliga son of Ṣubhamkara living in Ṣrī Nadralapura, and of Prāgvāṭa family The inscription was inscribed by one Gajaila.

A similar inscription of Ṣrī Pūnapāksha bearing no date but of the time of Kumārapāla has also been found at Ratanpura in the Jodhapur State, giving the grant of Abhaya and promulgating Amārī at the instance of the same two gentlemen Pūtiga and Ṣāliga (Prachina Jaina Lekha Samgrapha pp. 201 - 203).

Thus we find that these two inscriptions corroborat the account of the D. K. We learn from th inscription of Āhalaṇadeva that Ṣrī Mahādeva was th prime minister in V. S. 1209-A. D. 1153. +

---

* Another inscription of V. S. 1209 but of the month the second Jyeshtha has als been found. An inscription of S. 1210-A. D. 1154 has been discovered at Bhātunda in Jodhap state of the Mahā-prachaṇda-daṇḍa-nāyaka Ṣrī Vaijāka Nadūla who is mentioned as a vassal of Kumārapāla.

A copper plate-grant of V. S. 1212-A. D. 1156 of Kumārapā has been recently discovered. It contains the whole geneolo

minister for his negligence in allowing the temple to delapidate (63).

The minister Vāgbhṭa then reminds the king of Someṣvara, and Kumārapāla orders that, that temple be also rebuilt. (94) The minister, under orders from the king, calls his men and instructs them to build the temples of Kedāra and Someṣvara (65). The artisans go there (96) and we are informed that the 'artists built that pair of temples' (97).

Then we are told that Kumārapāla receiving blessings from Ārhatas built a temple with gold and jewels containing an image of Pārṣvanātha made of sphaṭika stone. This temple, according to the commentary, was built in Aṇahillapura (98). Another temple of Pārṣvanātha was built in Ṣrī Devapattana (99).

When these temples were built travellers everywhere were talking like this : Have you, my good friend ! heard of the city of Someṣvara ? Have you been there ? Have you gone, good man ! to the wide city of Gurjaras ? Have you seen the beautiful temple known as Kumāra-Vihāra ? (100). +

At the desire of Ṣambhu to stay in Aṇahillapura expressed in a dream, Kumārapāla built a temple to that god known as Kumārapāleṣvara (101). The sages bless and praise Kumārapāla and ask him to inaugurate an era after his name as he had freed the earth from debts (102).

\+ सोमेट्पुरी३मकलय३ः सुमता३इ आप ३ः
साधा३उ गूर्जरपुरे अगम३ः पृथा३उ ।
तत्र३ अभू३र्वरकुमारविहारचैत्य-
दृष्टया३इ दिक्विति तद्वाजनि पान्थवार्ता ॥ स. २०, श्लो. १००,

From an inscription–discovered in the temple of Bhadra Kali at Prabhas Pattana dated Valabhi Samvat 850, month of Āshādha (V. S. 1225 = A. D. 1169) which is an eulogy of Bhāva Bṛhaspati who was made a gaṇda or officer – in – charge of Somanātha, we get some useful information about the rebuilding of the temple of Somanātha. The first thing that we are able to infer is that the whole work was over before V. S. 1225–A. D. 1169, five years prior to Kumārapāla's death. Another thing that we learn is that it was at the suggestion of Bhāva Bṛhaspati that Kumārapāla ordered the re–building of the temple. It may be that Bhāva might have approached the king through Vāgbhaṭa who might have drawn the attention of Kumārapāla upon the necessity of re–building the temple simultaneously with the rebuilding of Kedāreṣvara. We may put this event between V. S. 1220–1225–A. D. 1164–1169.

The last great political event of Kumārapāla's reign was his war with Mallikārjuna of Konkaṇa of Ṣilāhāra dynasty. × This event is not narrated in the Samskṛta Dvyāṣraya but it forms the subject–matter of the sixth canto of the Prākṛta Dvyāṣraya.

The whole of the P. D. K. is devoted to the life of Kumārapāla and is entitled Kumārapālacharita. The preceding five cantos describe the city of Aṇahillapura and the daily life of Kumārapāla and also the seasons.

× See the B. G. Vol. I p. 185–186. "Of this Mallikārjuna two stone–inscriptions have been found one at Chiplun dated A. D. 1156 (Saka 1078) the other at Bassein dated A. D. 1160 (Saka 1082). p. 86.

In the sixth canto, after the description of the moon-rise (vs. 1–21) comes the description of the holding of the Royal assembly with Kumārapāla seated on a golden throne (22–39). Sāndhivigrahika or the Minister for peace and war reports to the king his success in war with Mallikārjuna of Konkaṇa. The choice army of the lord of Konkaṇa is referred to. His valour, which would make one forget the valour of the famous fiftytwo heroes, is mentioned. The march of Kumārapāla's soldiers to Konkaṇa is described. The enemy riding his elephant comes out of his city whose name is given as Ṭhāṇa (v. 49) which must be the modern Thāṇā near Bombay. He made his way into the Gurjara army and a terrific fight followed. The enemy's elephant was pierced by the arrows of Gurjaras. So also the rider – the lord of Konkaṇa. "His lotus-like head was cut off by your soldiers" (vs. 41–70).

The Minister of War and Peace continues his narrative thus : "You have earned the royal power of Kunkaṇa consisting of seven departments. Thus enjoying the south, you are joined to the Ṣrī of Ṣrīnagara, Tilanga and Kānchī (vs. 71–72). *

Then the reports of the exploits of Kumārapāla's army in other parts of the country are given (vs. 73–95). Last comes the vijnapti or request of the lord of Jāngala. (vs, 96–101) From this we learn that Kumārapāla had crushed Turuka, the lord of Dhilli (Delhi) and the king of Kasi (v. 96). The

* पहु, सिरि–नयर–सिरीए जुज्जसि, जुप्पसि तिलङ्गलच्छीए ।
जुज्जसि कञ्चि–सिरीए, भुञ्जन्तो दाहिणिं इण्हिं ॥ (७२. स. ६.)

reporting goes on till mid-night when the assembly disperses (v. 107).

The P. C. throws more light on this episode. We learn from it that it was Āmbaḍa (a son of Udayana) who first offered himself to fight Mallikārjuna of Konkaṇa. He was made the General of the army and despatched with other Sāmantas or chiefs. Somaprabhasūri, a contemporary, corroborates this information of the P. C. He says Kumārapāla used to win victories even with Vaṇija generals of the army like Āmbaḍa. ×

Āmbaḍa or Āmrabhaṭa marched to Konkaṇa whithout any break and came to the banks of the river Kalaviṇī which was in high floods. As he was crossing the river and a part of the army was encamping on the other bank, Mallikārjuna attacked the invading army and put it to flight. Āmbaḍa returned feeling disgraced; but he was again encourged to fight Mallikārjuna with a new army and other Sāmantas. The same river was crossed by the ford made in the first expedition and when the "unequal" fight began Āmbaḍa 'carefully made Mallikārjuna his aim' and approached him. He mounted Mallikārjuna's elephant and threw him down, and when other Sāmantas or chiefs were engaged in looting the city he cut off the head of Mallikārjuna and wrapped it in gold and worshipped the 'feet of the king Kumārapāla with this lotus in the form of the head of the enemy'.

× अधुना तन्नमस्कारं स्मरतो मम शत्रवः ।
वणिजैरपि जीयन्ते दण्डेशैरम्बडादिभिः ॥ (p. 471. K. Pra.)

The booty that Āmbaḍa had won is also described by the P. C. (pp. 80 - 81).

We find in the inscription of Tejahpāla dated V. S. 1287-A. D. 1231 previously referred to that when the Paramāra king Dhārāvarsha of Abu (V. S. 1220-76) 'marched to the battle-field, the queens of the lord of Konkaṇa began to weep' (J. P. J. S. II Part II, p. 79). This means that he must have been one of the chiefs who went to fight as an ally of Kumārapāla against Mallikārjuna of Ṣilhāra dynasty. From another source, we learn that the Chauhana king Someṣvara was also with Kumārapāla's army fighting in Konkaṇa+

The final battle must have been fought before A. D. 1162 which is the earliest known date of Mallikārjuna's successor Aparāditya. *

This success extended the Gurjara empire as far as Kānchi in the south - the original home of Aṇahillapura Chālukya's, if the copper - plate of Chāmuṇḍarāja recently discovered may be interpreted to suggest such a connection. In the north, the king of Delhi - Viṣaldeva Vigraharāja Chauhāna - was his vassal. This, we learn from an inscription of this king dated V. S 1220-A. D. 1164. In the east Mālava and Mevāḍa were in his possession; and if the Prākṛta Dvyāṣraya of Hemachandra is to be believed, the sway of Kumārapāla extended as far as Gauḍa. In the west, his power extended as far as Sindh. If this inference is correct, Kumārapāla in the last years of his reign, at least, must have been almost an All-India - Emperor. However that might be, the Gurjara

+ Pt. Oza's Rajputaneka Itihasa.

* See B. G. Vol I, pp. 185-186.

Empire was of considerable extent in all directions and it reached its widest extent in Kumārapāla's time ×

According to the Śrīmālapurāṇa a Vaiśya named Sunanda who was native of Paṭṭanāpura i. e. Aṇahilvāḍa-pattana requested the Śrī to reside in Aṇahillapura and so the goddess took leave of Bhīnnamāla and proceeded to Pāṭan in V. S. 1203, Vaisakha suda 3–A. D. 1147.

× There is a minor inscription of V. S. 1228–A. D. 1172 discovered at Bhaḍalai in Mārawada which simply refers to the regining king as "Srī Kumārapāladeva" without any title whatsoever.

The majority of the inscriptions pertaining to Kumārapāla's reign discovered up till now are those of his Sāmantas or vassals. They give us an idea of the extent of his way. Thus we gather from the inscription of V. S. 1202–A. D. 1196 discovered at Mangarol that the king Mūluka of Gohila family (capable of governing Saurāshtra) was Kumārapāla's vassal; so also from that of V. S 1205–A. D. 1149 and that of V. S. 1218–A. D. 1162 discovered at Kiradu in the Jodhapur state that Someśvara of Paramāra family was his vassal, from that of V. S. 1207–A. D. 1151 discovered at Abu that Yaśodhavala of Paramara family was his vassal; from a copper-plate of V. S. 1218–A. D. 1162 that Kīrtipāla of Chauhana family was also his Sāmanta; from the Śivālika inscription of V. S. 1220–A. D. 1164 that Viśaldeva Vigraharāja of Delhi was his Sāmanta; from that of V. S. 1220–A. D. 1164 of Udayapura in Mevāda that Vasantapāla of Stharovaka (?) family was his vassal; from that of V. S. 1220–A. D. 1164 discovered at Abu and from that of V. S. 1223–A. D. 1167, we learn that Dhārāvarsha of Parmara family and Kelhandeva of Chauhana family were also his vassals. Some of these vassal-chiefs were related to Kumārapāla through marriage, as for example, Ānna of Sapadālaksha or Someśvara the father of the famous Pṛthvirāja Chauhāṇa.

This might be interpreted to mean that the glory of the Gurjaras reached its Zenith in Aṇahillapura in the reign of Kumārapāla and that many influencial and rich families must have finally left Bhīnnamāla for Patan. (Adhyaya 75.)

We have some reliable information about the principal political personages of Kumārapāla's reign. The P.C. tells us that after Kumārapāla occupied the throne, he made Āliga and Udayana, the elder statesmen of Jayasimha's reign - who must have become very old by this time, his principal advisors (Jyāyān Pradhāna), and that Ṣrī Vāgbhaṭa popularly known as Bāhaḍa, a son of Udayana, his great minister (Mahāmātya). The D. K. also, as we saw, mentions Vāgbhaṭa as Kumārapāla's minister who was entrusted with the work of building temples of Kedāreṣvara and Someṣvara. From the accounts of the Prabandhas also, it appears that this Vāgbhaṭa was a person of great influence and power in the reign of Kumārapāla.

Udayaṇa who was popularly known as Minister Udā was one of the remarkable men of the age. He was intimately connected with the life of Hemachandra. Short accounts of his life are given in the P. P. S. and the P. C. He is also mentioned in the Pra. Cha. as well as in the Prabandhakoṣa and the V. T. K. The account in the P - ms of the P. P. S. is more complete than those of others.

According to it Udayaṇa belonged to the Ṣrīmāla community and was originally an inhabitant of a village named Vāghara near Jāvālipura (or Jalore) in Māravāda. His geneology is as follows : Ṣreshṭhi Bohittha - Aṣve-ṣvara - Yakshanāga - Vīradeva - Udayaṇa. His wife's

name was Suhādevī who was a daughter of Thakkura Sāmba of Dhavalakakka (modern Dholka). He was doing business in ghee. He appears to have been an intrepid fellow from the early part of his life as he used to go out for his business even at mid-night with his bow and quiver of arrows. Once while going about like this he got a good omen and went with his wife and two sons Bāhaḍa and Chāhaḍa to Āṣāpallī which was then recently renamed Karṇāvatī.

Arriving there Udayana first went to worship in a Jaina temple, which according to the P. C. was known as Vāyatīya - jināyatana (Jaina temple of Vāyatas or Vāyaḍās). As he was coming out of the temple, he met the wife of Ṣālāpati Tihuṇasīha (that is Sālavi or Master-weaver Tribhuvanasimha) who with her servants was going into the temple. The P. C. gives her name as Lachhī (Lakshmī) a Srāvikā of the Chhimpikā community. +

Udayana was taken by her to her house where he was treated as a guest by her husband. Tihuṇasīha asked him whether he would stay in his house or independently. Udā resquested that he would like to live independently and was given a small piece of land by Tihuṇasīha near his house.

As he was erecting the door, he discovered a hidden treasure. King Karṇa, who was at that time in his new city, called Tihuṇasīha and asked him to hand over the newly discovered wealth. Tihuṇasīha answered: 'Your Majesty! a certain Māruka (Māravāḍi) has come to me. In his house something is discovered. I

* That is Chhipā community-the same as Salavi community-whose hereditary profession was weaving, colouring and printing of cloth. The P. C. 56.

do not know what it is." Udā was sent for; but when Karna saw that Udā was a lucky man he was given the seal of ministership and the title of Rāṇimā.

This is how the early rise of Udayana is described by the P. P. S. and also by the P. C. with a few variations (The P. P. S. p. 32., The P. C. p. 56).

The P. P. S. in the beginning of its account tells us that Udayana was made the Governor of Lāṭa and given ministerial seals by the king. The name of the king is not mentioned. He must have been given that post by either Karṇa or more probably by Siddharāja Jayasimha.

When Udayana was staying at Khambhāta (Cambay) probably as a governor of Laṭa - Province he performed the Dikshā - festival of Hemachandra. We have referred to the incident of his meeting Kumārapāla at Cambay when the latter was running about for his life. We have also mentioned, on the authority of the Pra. Cha, his fight against Khengāra of Junagadha. According to the P. P. S. it was Udayana who slayed Khengāra (p. 34).

We saw that Udayana was appointed as an elderly counsellor with Āliga, while his son Vāgbhaṭa was made the Prime Minister (The P. C. p. 79).

His wife Suhādevi died when Udayana was considerably old. A typical incident is narrated by the P. P. S. with reference to Udayana's re-marriage at the age of seventy. Vāgbhaṭa saw that his father was feeling unhappy. So he thought of remarrying him. He found out a grown up girl (lit. an old daughter वृद्धा सुता) who was a daughter of a merchant in Vāyaḍapura. Under the pretext of a pilgrimage Udayana

was taken there. A dinner party was arranged, but the Sangha (community) refused to sit to dinner as it was pre-arranged by Vāgbhaṭa. Udayana asked the reason thereof and he was told unless he obeyed the word of the community which was that he should remarry – they would not sit to dine.

Udayana said "I am seventy years old. This is not the time to marry. Untimely doings do not look well." Vāgabhaṭa interposed "The authority of the community is very powerful." Udayana said "Who will give his daughter?" – meaning of course to an old man like himself. The whole thing, was, however pre-arranged and Udayana was married to the daughter of a merchant of Vāyaḍāpura. She was the mother of Rāyaviddara Āmbaḍa or Āmrabhaṭa the killer of kings. This Āmrabhaṭa is the same as is referred to by Somaprabhasūri-a contemporary of Kumārapāla – as the Vaṇija General of Kumārapāla's army and who, according to the P. C., slayed Mallikārjuna of Konkaṇa.

According to the P. P. S. Udayana was mortally wounded in his fight against Sāngaṇa Dodiāka at Melagapura after Udayaṇa had defeated and killed Khengāra (p. 32 & p. 34 *). The last two desires of this dying general were to rebuild two temples – one on the Satrunjaya Hill and the other at Broach known as Ṣakunikāvihāra. The first desire was fulfilled by Āmbaḍa or Āmrabhaṭa. The final ceremony of flag-hoisting on the temple at Ṣatrunjaya took place,

* This account supplements the account of the Pra. cha. p. 322. The P. C. gives the name as Saunsara of Surāshṭra p. 86.

according to the P. C. in V. S. 1211–A. D. 1155, at the hands of Vāgbhaṭa (p. 87).

From the Kiradu inscription of V. S. 1209–A. D. 1153, we learn that Śrī Mahādeva was the prime minister at Aṇahillapura at that time. This Mahādeva must be the same as was appointed the Governor of Mālava by Jayasimha. It is likely that Ujjayinī and Dhārā must have been in his charge when Ballāla of Gonarda rose in rebellion, and that after Ballāla was slain in battle, General Kakka might have been appointed the Governor of Mālava. Mahādeva, on retiring from Mālava, must have been given the position of prime minister which was occupied by his father Dādāka. We do not know how Kakka and Mahādeva were related. We know from Hemachandra that Kakka was a Brāhmaṇa. Probably he was a Nāgara of Vadanagara. Mahādeva, we know, definitely, was a Nāgara of Vadanagara. It was customary to give the position of a father to his son in those days. In all likelihood, Kakka was a son of Mahādeva. But this is only a guess.

From the inscription of V. S. 1220–A. D. 1164 we learn that at that time Jaṣodhavala or Yaṣodhavala was the prime-minister at Aṇahillapura. From the inscription of V. S.–1225 A. D. 1169, it appears that Yaṣodhavala or Dhavala was probably a Brāhmaṇa of Ānandapura, that is a Nāgara of Vadanagara. There he is referred to in the past tense, so it appears either he had ceased to occupy that position or that he was not alive at the time. The wife of this minister built two temples, probably near Junāgadha.

We may, here, mention Kapardin the treasurer of Kumārapāla. According to the P. C., it was at his

suggestion that Kumārapāla, even at the age of fifty learnt Saṃskṛta grammar and three poems and thus earned the title of Vichāra-Chaturmukha (p. 89). Kapardin himself, it appears, was a learned man and a friend of Hemachandra (p. 90). When Vāgbhaṭa was attending to the building of the temple at Ṣatrunjaya near which he founded a town named after him Bāhaḍapura, he gave the charge of his post to this Kapardin. (p. 87). Kapardin was one of those persons who accompanied Kumārapāla in his pilgrimage to Ṣatrunjaya. He is called Bhāṇḍāgārika Kapardin by the P. P. S. (p. 43).

In the Prabandhakoṣa of Rājaṣekhara this Bhāṇḍāgārika Kapardin is also called a leader amongst poets and donors (कवीनां दातृणां च धुर्यो भाण्डागारिकः कपर्दी ॥ p. 48).

Kapardin was given the post of prime-ministership by Ajayapāla-the successor of Kumārapāla. Even though warned by a Māruka who knew the significance of omens, he accepted the post. He was later on arrested and killed by Ajayapāla in his palace. (The P. C. p. 96).

About Kumārapāla's generals of the army, we have also some information. The D. K., as we have seen, mentions the Gurjara - Brahma - Senānī - whom the commentator Abhayatilakagaṇi identifies with Kakka. He crushed the rebellion of Ballāla.

From the Chitodagaḍha inscription of V. S. 1207-A. D. 1151, we infer that the "Daṇḍanāyaka Sajjana" was with Kumārapāla in his expedition against Ānāka, and we learn that he was one of those few people who accompanied the king to Chitoḍagadha leaving the rest of the army in the village of Ṣālipura. This Sajjana is probably the same as was appointed the governor

of Saurāshtra by Jayasimha and as built the temple on Girnara. If he is the same person he must have been very old at the time of Kumārapāla's expedition; because, as we saw on the authority of the V. T. K., he completed the temple on the Girnar mountain in V. S. 1185-A. D. 1129 (p. 9). This Sajjana of the Srīmāla community belonged to the family of Jāmba who was a Mahāmātya of Vanarāja. According to the P. P. S. he had two more brothers named Āmba and Dhavala. +

From the inscriptions of V. S. 1210-A. D. 1154, and V. S. 1213-A. D. 1157 we learn that Ṣrī Vaijāka or Vaijalladeva was the Mahāprachaṇḍa Daṇḍanāyaka (that is the great terrible general) of Kumārapāla. In the reign of Ajayapāla, we learn from a copper-plate of V. S. 1231-A. D. 1175 that he was a governor of Narmadā-Taṭa that is of Lāṭa Deṣa.

From the P. C., we learn that Āmbaḍa - son of Udayana and according to the P. P. S. a step - brother of Vāgbhaṭa (p. 32) was also one of the generals of Kumārapāla. He was, as we saw, responsible for the conquest of Konkaṇa and slaying of Mallikārjuna.

+In addition to this Sajjana the General of Jayasimha and Kumārapāla, prabandhas mention three more Sajjanas. One is Sajjana Sākariyāka of Jayasimha's time. (P. P. S. p. 36). Another is Sajjana the potter who saved the life of Kumārapāla by hiding him in a koṭhi. He was rewarded with Chitrākūta when Kumārapāla became king. The Daṇḍanāyaka Sajjana of Kumārapāla who accompanied him to Chītod is identified by some with this potter Sajjana (P. P. S. p. 38). There is another Sajjana of the time of Bhima II who was also a general and an orthodox Jaina of the Ṣrimāla community. (P. P. S. p. 49).

The P. P. S. quotes an apabhramṣa dohā composed and recited on the occasion by a Chāraṇa * which definitely makes Āmbaḍa responsible for killing Mallikārjuna. According to the Pṛthvirājavijaya of Jayānaka, however, it was Someṣvara, the father of Pṛthvirāja Chauhāṇa who killed Mallikārjuna.

We may here mention the names of his ministers who belonged to the family of Vimala.

The apabhramṣa praṣasti of the Neminathachariu continues its narrative up to the reign of Kumārapāla. We learnt from it that Dhavala – the son of Neḍha was a minister of Karṇa; he continued to occupy that position in the reign of Jayasimha also. Through the boon of the goddess Dhaṇuhāvi, (that is – his family deity – Vindhyavāsinī who, as we saw, was given that name because she resided in the bow of his ancestor Lahara–) he built a temple known as Revantaprāsāda.

This Dhavala had a son named Ānanda. Ānanda's wife Paumāvaī or Padmāvatī by name was very religious. He also occupied the position of his father in the reigns of Siddharāja and Kumārapāla. He had a son named Puhaipāla or Pṛthvipāla who also occupied ministerial posts. Pṛthvipāla built the beautiful manḍapa in the temple at Abu built by his ancestor Vimala. He built several other temples. It was in his temple at Aṇahillapura that Haribhadrasūri completed his Nemināthachariu.

Thus this praṣasti gives us the history of an illustrious family of the Prāgvāṭas who played such

---

* अंब [ड] हुंतु वाणीउ मल्लिकार्जुन हत्त राउ ।
पाडी माथउं वाढिउं उअडिहिं देविणु पाउ ॥

an important part in the history of Gujarat, from the time of Vanarāja to Kumārapāla.

In this connection, the name of Vasāha Ābhaḍa may be mentioned. He was not directly connected with the state in any way. He must have, however, been a very influential person of the times, as we shall see anon he was one of those who was consulted by Kumārapāla about the succession to the throne after him. From a very poor condition he rose to be one of the richest men of Aṇahillapura. He maintained his high position throughout the reigns of Kumārapāla, Ajayapāla and Bhima II.

We learn from the P. P. S. that of the sons of Ābhaḍa two were Māheṣvarins, that is, worshippers of Maheṣvara or Ṣiva and three were Ṣrāvakas, that is Jainas. (p. 33).

According to the Prabandharatnakoṣa of Rājasekharasūri he had a daughter named Chāmpalade , who had become a widow early in life, and who used to manage his household affairs being very learned and tactful (p. 100). It was this Ābhaḍa who saved the temple of Tārangā from being destroyed by the orders of Ajayapāla.

Now we come to the Purohitas of Siddharāja and Kumārapāla. We saw that Āmaṣarman was the Purohita of Karṇa. It was through his miraculous powers that the evil effect of the magic of the Purohita of the king of Mālava was warded off. The Surathotsava informs us that it was through his blessings that Siddharāja could conquer the king of Sindhu, the king of Mālava and the king of Sapādalaksha. Kumāra performed many sacrifices and built many lakes.

This Kumāra had a son named Sarvadeva. He was proficient in the Smṛti of Manu. He was a devotee of Vishṇu. We are not informed whether he was Jayasimha's Purohita after the death of Sarvadeva. Probably he was.

Sarvadeva had a son named Āmiga. He was the Purohita of Kumārapāla. Whether he was the same as is described to be an opponent of Hemachandra by the P. C., we do not know. It was he who carried the ashes of the body of the king Kumārapāla to Prayāga.

Kumārapāla had no direct male heir to succeed him. As usual, the rival claimants to the throne must have made the crowned head very uneasy. We learn from the Prabandhakośa just referred to, that once when Kumārapāla and Hemachandra had grown old, a consultation was held at night between Kumārapāla, Hemachandra and Ābhaḍa–probably in the residence of Hemachandra–as to who should succeed the king. "The king asks, 'Your worship! I have no son, whom should I put on the throne?' His Holiness answered 'Make Pratāpamalla–son of your daughter–king. He will maintain Dharma. Ajayapāla will undo the Dharma you have established.' Here Ābhaḍa intervenes 'Your worship! Whatever sort,–one of the family only proves useful!' Again Śrī Hema said 'Under no circumstances make Ajayapāla king.' After this consultation the three rose to go." (P. K. p. 98).

We learn from the same authority that there was a feud in the group of disciple–monks of Hemachandra. On one side were Rāmachandra, Guṇachandra and others; on the other side was Bālachandra. This Bālachandra was a friend of Ajaypāla – the nephew of the king. He

overheard the consultation about the succession to the throne and informed Ajayapāla of it. This made Ajayapāla a sworn enemy of Rāmachandra and his party, but a friend of Ābhaḍa, who, as we saw, later on used his influence in saving the Jaina shrine at Tārangā.

According to the same authority, Kumārapāla died of poison administered by Ajayapāla thirty-two days after the death of Hemachandra. This event must have taken place in V. S. 1230 according to the year beginning with Kārtika or Chaitra but V. S. 1229 according to the one beginning with Ashādha. In the Udayapura inscription dated V. S. 1229, Vaiskakha Sudi 3 Monday, we find Ajayapāla mentioned as the reigning sovereign. This means that Kumārapāla must have died, according to the Kārtikādi year, in the early part of the year V. S. 1230-A. D. 1174. This correctly removes the discrepancy between the P. C. and the Udayapura inscription.

Thus we see that the seeds of the disruption of Gujarat power were already sown in the last days of Kumārapāla's life. The disintegration of the Gujarat empire soon followed. For a time like the dying flicker of a lamp, the glory of Gujarat shone bright again in the time of Vīradhavala Vaghelā and his great ministers Vastupāla and Tejapāla, to be extinguished for ever in the reign of Karṇa II. Gujarat continued to flourish and grow rich and build temples even after this, but its political self-respect was gone! The causes of this disintegration and downfall must have been many and various, but they must not be sought in the differences of the religious creeds of the people.

In fact, the harmony, no doubt with human lapses here and there, between different creeds was phenomenal, so much so as to appear incredible to one who is only familiar with the history of Christianity and Islam! The main cause of the disruption seems to be that the kings believed and their ministers and religious priests encouraged them to believe that the state was the personal property of the king and that it was treated as such. Add to this a certain lack of political self-respect which allowed the people to live and multiply and prosper rather than die and become annihilated if not allowed to live as free men. This, howerver, was only one, though in my opinion, the primary cause; there being many other contributary causes.

16

What was the city of Aṇahillapurapāṭaka like, this Gurjaradeśarājadhāni-capital of Gurjaradeśa-of which its people - poets, kings and even retired monks-were so proud? Vāgbhaṭa-poet and critic and a contemporary of Jayasimha - called it one of the three jewels of the world-the other two being the king Jayasimha Siddharāja himself and his elephant Srī Kalaśa. (See f. n. p. CXCVI). In the time of J. it had become a point of honour-to be settled either by martial or literary passage of arms-to maintain three kings: that Gujarat was like Bṛhaspati - the teacher of gods - in the matter of discrimination, that Pattana - (literally city) that is Aṇahillapura was a veritable ocean of men and that the king was the emperor of Siddhas. *

---

* गूर्जरत्राया विवेकबृहस्पतित्वं नृपस्य सिद्धचक्रित्वं पत्तनस्य च नरसमुद्रत्व-मसहन् (°सहमानः) विवदते pp. 28–29 P. P. S.

So here I may pause for a while to put before the student some of the material which will help his historical imagination draw, at least in outline, the picture of this city from which, so to say, radiated the glory of the Gurjara Empire.

We are fortunate in possessing some very good contemporary descriptions of the city. The student will find that the two descriptions of Aṇahillapura from the pen of Hemachandra himself in his two Dvyāśrayas –Saṃskṛta and Prākṛta-are, in spite of poetic egaggerations and embellishments, sufficiently realistic to guide his historical imagination. The Prākṛta description in the Ku. Pra. of Somaprabha – a junior contemporary of Kumārapāla is also interesting. The inscription of the General Keśava of Dadhipadra District gives in one verse a characteristic description of Aṇahillapura. Of later descriptions the one in the Kīrttikaumudī of Someśvara – the friend of Vastupāla–is very fine and gives us an idea of the city as it must have impressed the poet in the last days of its glory.

As to the history of the place, up till now it was held by scholars that it began with the founding of Aṇahillapura by Vanarāja in V. S. 802 – A. D. 746. But the V. T. K. of Jinaprabha edited and published by Muni Jinavijaya gives a tradition which enables us to trace its history three – hundred years prior to Vanarāja. From it,+ it becomes clear that

+ Jinaprabhasūri in the twenty–sixth Kalpa of his V.T.K. while narrating an early tradition about the building of the temple of Arishṭanemi in Anahillapura incidentally gives some interesting details about the earlier history of the place before the time of Vanarāja. He also enumerates the names of the kings who ruled in the city from Vanarāja to Allauadīna

the temple of Arishṭanemi, the history of which he is narrating, existed in the time of Jinaprabhasūri and that a festival in memory of the flag-hoisting day was held on the fullmoon day of every Mārgaṣīrsha. According to the tradition learnt by Jinaprabhasūri the flag-hoisting ceremony first took place in the year

Khilji. The tradition. that he narrates, he learnt, as he himself says, from 'the mouth of antiquarians' (मुखात् पुराविदां श्रुत्वा). I translate it below as it appears to contain some historical facts.

"Formerly there was a very rich merchant named Jakkha in the city of Siri Kaṇṇa-ujja (Kanouj). He, once upon a time, with a caravan of bullocks, taking merchandize with him, in order to trade, started for Gujjaradeṣa which was a part of Kaṇṇa-ujja* and given as dowry to Mahaṇigā-the daughter of the lord of Kaṇṇauajja. In due course he encamped in Lakkhārāma on the bank of the river Sarassaī (Sarasvatī). **Indeed it was formerly the place where Aṇahillavāḍaya was founded.** Encamping his caravan, as the merchant was residing (lit sitting) there, monsoon approached. The clouds began to pour down. Once upon a time in the month of Bhaddvāya (Bhādrapada) that caravan of bullocks suddenly disappeared. Nobody knew where it had gone; a search was made but in vain. Then in a dream came Bhagavai Ambādevī to him whose heart was aching with anxiety on account of this almost total loss of property. She spoke "Dear boy ! are you asleep or awake ?" Jakkha said "Oh Mother ! how is sleep possible to me whose caravan of bullocks-whole property-is lost ?" The goddess spoke " Good man ! In this Lakkhārāma there is a triad of idols under a tree of Ambiliyā. Get three men to excavate it. One idol is that of Siri Ariṭṭhaṇemi, another that of Siri Pāsanāha and the third that of Ambiyādevī." Jakkha asked " Bhagavai ! There are many Ambiliya trees; how am I to recognise that particular region ?" The goddess answered

* For the explanation of this anachronism of the tradition see p. CVIII.

V. S. 502 = A. D. 446. At that time the place was known as Lakkhārāma. Jinaprabha is not clear on the point whether this ceremony took place in the life-time of Jakkha the original builder of the temple. From the fact that it is the people who request Jaśobhadda

---

" Where you see a circle of red metallic ochre (धाउमय) and a collection of flowers, know that as the place of the triad of idols. When that triad of idols will be discovered and worshipped, your bullocks will return of their own accord.

" In the morning after getting up and first performing (his usual) worship, he did according (to the behests of the goddess) and the three idols were discovered. They were worshipped with proper ceremony. Within a moment the bullocks returned in an unimaginable way. The merchant was pleased. In due course he raised a temple, (lit a palace) and the idols were installed.

"Once upon a time when the monsoon was over Siri Jasobhadda Sūri–the ornament of Bambhāṇa gaccha while going to the city of Khambhāitta (Cambay) from Aggahāragāma which was adorned with 1800 paṭṭasāliyagharas (residences for Jaina monks) happened to pass by that place. The people requested "Your holiness ! you cannot go further transgressing this holy place." Then the Sūri bowed to the idols, and performed the flag-hoisting ceremony with festivities on the fullmoon day of Maggasira (S. Mārgaśīrsha). Even today every year the flag-hoisting ceremony is performed on the same day. That flag-hoisting festival took place when fivehundred and two years (502) had elapsed after Vikkamāiccha (S. Vikramāditya).

" Then in the Vikrama year eight-hundred and two (802) the king Vaṇarāya the pearl of Chāukkaḍa family (वंस) **founded Pattaṇa on the site of Lakkhārāma** in the region approved by Aṇahilla Govāla. (अणहिल्लगोवालपरिक्खिए पएसे)." V. T. K. p. 51.

After this the author gives the geneologies of the king who ruled over Pātaṇa up to Allaudīn. "There were there seven kings of Chāukkaḍa dynasty viz. Vaṇarāya, Jogarāya, Khemarāya, Bhuaḍa, Vayarasīha, Rayaṇāiccha, and Sāmantasīha.

and not Jakkha we might infer that at the time Jakkha was not living. But it can be argued against this view that usually it is the samgha that invites the Āchāryas. Any how if the ceremony took place after the life-time of Jakkha we will have to put the building of the temple earlier. how much earlier we have no means to guess.

However that might be, we have here a tradition informing us of the existence of a human habitation known as Lakkhārāma–probably a town of mercantile importance, full threehundred years before the founding of the city which took place, according to this account as also that of the P. C., in the year V. S. 802–A. D. 746.

Whether the story of Jakkha the merchant of Kānyakubja is historical or not, the existence of Lakkhārāma prior to the founding of Aṇahillapāṭaka along its site as also the existence of the temple of Arishṭanemi in Lakkhārāma seem to be historical. If we study the history of the capital cities of India, we will discover, in many cases, that they are not founded in altogether wild places. The places where the capital cities were founded, had, generally speaking prior to

---

Then in the very same city there were eleven kings of Chālukka dynasty viz Mūlarāya, Chāmuṇḍarāya, Vallabharāya, Dullaharāya, Bhīmadeva, Kaṇṇa, Jayasīmhadeva, Kumārapāladeva, Ajayadeva, Bāla-Mūlarāya and Bhīmadeva. Then in the family of Vāghelās were born the kings Lūṇappasāya, Vīradhavala, Vīsaladeva, Ajjuṇadeva, Sārangadeva, and Kaṇṇadeva. After that the rule of Surattāṇas Allāvadiṇa etc. prevailed in Gujjaradharitti. That lord Ariṭṭhaṇemī whose door-keeper is the goddess Kohaṇḍī is even to day worshipped in the same way." p. 51.

their being capitals, some importance-either mercantile or military. We may quote the instance of Ahmedabad or we may refer to the earlier history of Pāṭaliputra. So in the case of Aṇahillapura, this tradition about the existence of Lakkhārāma points to the same thing. +

The inscription of the Vāhinīpati Keṣava who was made a Daṇda - nāyaka at Dadhipadra or Dohada of V. S. 1196 - A. D. 1140 contains the earliest dated description of Aṇahillapāṭaka as far as I have been able to discover. It is as follows:—

'अणहिल्लपाटकनगरं सुरमन्दिररुद्धतरणिहयमार्गम् ।
यस्यास्ति राजधानी राज्ञोऽयोध्येव रामस्य ॥ ३ ॥

The city of Aṇahillapāṭaka in which the path-way of the horses of the sun is obstructed by the temples of gods is the capital of the king just as Ayodhyā was the capital of Rāma.' This description of the city, though short, is, quite characteristic of the place. In the V. S. 1196 - A. D. 1140 in the reign of Jayasimha Siddharāja Aṇahillapāṭaka must have been veritably a city of temples. We have referred, on the authority of the P. C. at their proper places, to the monuments built here by several kings. These temples of gods, as we can gather from the Kumāravihāraṣataka of Rāmachandra a pupil of Hemachandra were not only places of devotion, but of artistic culture also.

The lay-out of this city of temples, was, probably, in the shape of a Swastika - as it appears from

+This name Lakkhārāma whose Samskṛta form would be Lakshārāma has a Buddhist ring about it. Buddhism must have been flourishing in the early part of the fifth century A. D. or even earlier in Gujarat. The description of Yuang Chang indicates that Buddhism in Molapo or Gujarat was not a new thing in his time, but something that was coming down from ages.

the very first verse + of its description by Hemachandra. It was surrounded by a fortifying wall which, as we learnt from the P. C., was first built by Bhūyaḍa. This Sāla, vapra or koṭṭa (all synonyms for city-wall) seems to have impressed the imagination of the poets very much; for as one approached the city the innumerable śikharas or domes of the temples and this wall with its turrets and gopuras must have caught the eye first and tickled the imagination. Hemachandra, in his Prākṛta Dvyāśraya, while describing the city, describes first the prākāra (the city - wall) as the looking-glass of the heavenly damsels referring to its high towers of sphaṭika - stone. *

In the Saṃskṛta Dvyāśraya he describes the city-wall thus: 'Here everywhere shines the Sāla (city-wall), like the Lord of serpents (Seshanāga - the cosmic serpant white in colour), in height like the Lord of mountains (Meru), looking down upon the enemies, with its white heads bearing banners that lick the heavens' (C. I. V. 127). Somaprabha, in the Ku. Pra., also, first describes the city-wall and compares it to a pearl-necklace. (p. 3).

Someśvara, in his K. K., also gives a similar simile and imagines it to be a hedge of good deeds to guard the city against Kali (C. I. v. 49). ×

\+ अस्ति स्वस्तिकवद् भूमेर्धर्मागारं नयास्पदम् ।
पुरं श्रिया सदाश्लिष्टं नाम्नाणहिलपाटकम् ॥ स. १. श्लो. ४.

* तिअसवईहरवहुमुहआदरिसीहूयफलिहसिलसिहरो ।
जस्सि पुहइवहूमुहअवयंसो सहइ पायारो ॥ स. १. श्लो. ३.

× See also Hemachandra's T. S. P. C. Parvan 10, canto XII, vv. 39 etc., the Vasantavilāsa of Bālachandra (p. 9 v. 40–44) and Hamira-mada-mardana of Jayasimhasūri p. 47 v. 23.

As we saw while referring to the Sahasralinga Lake, surrounding Aṇahillapura were great forests which lent a sylvan magnificence to the approaches of the city. Someśvara describes the surrounding thus "Where near by is a circle of forests full of innumerable trees which looks like the shadow of the high city-wall."+

There was also a moat round the city-wall which is compared to Sea protecting his daughter Lakshmī in the city.

Aonther attractive feature of the city must have been the holy river Sarasvatī. It appears that the river Sarasvatī must not have been so dry then as it is now near Aṇahillapura. × This virgin river lent a sacred charm to the surroundings of the city. There is a whole Purāṇa called Sarasvatī Purāṇa dedicated to this river which is very useful for the history of Aṇahillapura. * The Sahasralinga Lake had its watersupply from this river whose waters, through channels, were first gathered and controlled in a well known as Rudra-kūpa (S. P. C. 16. vs 1-2.). Hemachandra describes it thus:

+ अनेकानोकहच्छन्ना प्रत्यासन्ना वनावलिः ।
यत्रोन्नतस्य वप्रस्यऽछायेव प्रतिभासते ॥ स. १. श्लो. ५०.

× Hemachandra, no doubt, exaggerates when he says that the 'waters of the river were fordable by boats (नाव्यजला), but it appears that the desciiption might hold good for monsoon and even winter. A study of the physical features of rivers of Gujarata indicates that there has been a progressive scarcity of water in them. Descriptions of Sābaramati, given by foreign traveller:, also, suggest such an increasing scarcity of water in that river also.

* In the opinion of Mr. Kanaiyalal B. Dave who has carefully studied this Purāṇa it was written in the reign of Jayasimha Siddharāja.

" Here is the Brāhmī river purifying Heaven and Earth, cutting off all sins and bearing the marine fire; the story of whose account is worth listening to, and whose waters are sweet to cattle and fordable by boats." " People going by bullocks and people going by boats do not care for their bullocks and boats being engrossed in the s veet songs of women guarding the rice – fields (in the river) – songs worth hearing ! " "In the fortnight sacred to the manes (श्राद्धपक्ष in the Ṣarad=Autmn) the ladies standing, look, from the gavāksha, (the windows, naturally, of the mansions on the bank of the river) at the land covered with grass pleasing to cattle and at the river (Sarasvatī) pleasing to the gavāksha " (C. I. vs. 23-25).

Hemachandra gives the following picture of the out–skirts of the city. " Its out–skirts (बहिर्मुखः) are resorted to by coy–boys and camel – boys, having shoulders as muscular as those of bulls, standing on the backs of the animals – outskirts covered with vegetation palatable to cows and camels." (v. 26).

But the glory of Aṇahillapura was its Royal Lake. We have already referred to it (p. p. CLXXXIX–CLPC) and we cannot go into its detailed description here. Poets of successive generations have sung of its beauty and magnificence. Suffice it to say that it was a monument which brought forth and revealed the best that was in the princes and the people of Gurjaradeṣa; that it was a place of worship, learning, and out–door recreation for the rich as well as the poor; that it afforded an opportunity to the best engineering skill in the construction of the lake, the Rudra – kūpa, and the feeding channels and to the best artistic talents of the

architects and the sculptors; that, in short, it was a proper symbol of the munificence and the love of magnificence of Gurjaratrā!

To the temples as a characteristic feature of the city, we have already referred. The mansions of the city are also described by Hemachandra and a typical residence of a rich man is described by Yaśahpāla in his Moharājaparājaya (Act III pp. 53–58). In the S' D. K. Hemachandra describes the gardens and the beauties who visited them thus: "Here in gardens lovely with all seasonal flowers shine damsels whose eyebrows are curved like the letter ऋ", etc. (v. 11). The third canto of the P. D. K. is devoted to the description of Kumārapāla's garden.

The great extent of the city, H. describes figuratively thus: "Oh people! the knee of Mārutī (Hanumān) which did not ache while wandering in Lankā would ache if he desired to go from end to end here! (v. 32). +

About the learned men of the city we shall speak in the next section. Here we may refer to the general literary culture of its men and women. We have already referred to the colleges built around Sahasralinga. Hemachandra tells us 'A tongue-tied student

+ In the Moharājaparājaya, Kubera describes Aṇahillapura from his aerial car to his wife Pātālachandrikā. The first thing that attracts his attention is the row of flags on the temple known as Kumāravihāra. Next he points to the river Sarasvatī and then to the Lake of Śri Siddharāja. Bakasthala and the pillar of victory are mentioned; the matchless palace of the king and the row of mansions in the market-place are admired. He concludes by saying ' In this glorious city what is not worth seeing ?" p. 67. See also the Vasantavilāsa canto II.

studying in the Vidyāmaṭha of this city would become a fine orator ! ' * ' A man who does not know how to utter a syllable would, here, in a moment, become learned in the six schools of philosophy ' (v. 39). Speaking about the Brahmins of the city, H. says ' They used to perform their six karmans, were of pure speech, and famous in all directions for their mastery of various departments of learning ' (v. 108). In verse 122 he describes how teaching was done. Hemachandra does not forget to mention the sweet speech, the beautiful voice, and the proficiency in fine arts of the women of Aṇahillapura (v.v. 35, 106, 111, etc.).

The happy family life of the citizens (v.v. 104, 132 etc.), their liberality in giving gifts (114 etc.), their hospitality (v. 63 etc.), their bravery and adventurous spirit (v.v. 17, 54, 113 etc) and the beauty of their women are also described by Hemachandra.

Coming to the religious life of the people, we find that all sects found place in Aṇahillapura and all the schools of philosophy were studied in the city. H. says it was a city which ' gave place to ninety-six sects and in it all the āṣramas lived joyfully; (that is people in Brahmacharyāṣrama, Gṛhastha°, Vānprastha° and Samnyāsa° lived happily in the city) '.+ The city

* The commentator explains the word Vidyāmaṭha thus: ' A type of residence, equipped with materials of feeding, clothing etc. for teachers and students made by kings.' This shows that the State not only supplied schools but boarding houses for students and teachers. That again indicates how education was endowed by the State in Gujarat. C. I v. 7.

+ Somaprabha says there was no envy between the different Dhārmikas – sectarians जह्सि समच्छरमणा जलासया न उण धम्मियसमूहा p. 4.

had representatives of Karmakānda as well as Brahmavādins (v. 82 etc.). The six gods - Brahmā, Vishṇu, Ṣiva, Sūrya, Soma and Kārtikeya were established in the city by its kings (v. 46), that is there were royal temples dedicated to these gods in Aṇahillapura. The sound of conches in the city's temples is said to over-power Kali (88). We are also told how a Jaina sees in Ārhaṭa, Ṣiva, Vishṇu and Brahmā (v. 79); and how the sixteenth Tīrthankara Ṣānti is remembered by his devotees (v. 129).

Though, thus, almost all the religious sects were represented in Aṇahillapura, Ṣaivism, Jainism, and to a certain extent Vaishṇavism seem to have occupied the place of honour.

The morality of the people as revealed by the synthesis of different Purushārthas–Human Purposes–is described in several verses (8, 20, 21, 45, 92, 130, 133 etc). In fact, H. in the very first verse of the description of the city calls Aṇahillapāṭaka–' An Abode of Dharma' (धर्मागार).

To Hemachandra, people of Aṇahillapura appeared " First in bravery, first in ṣāstra (science, learning), first in self - control, first in meditation, first in truth, first in six schools of philosophy, and first in six angas of Vedas'. ×

17

When describing the reign of the Bhima I, we had occasion to refer to the intellectual life of Aṇahillapura-

× प्राङ् शौर्यवृत्तौ प्राङ् शास्त्रे प्राङ् शमे प्राङ् समाधिषु ।
प्राङ् सत्ये प्राङ् षड्दर्शन्यां प्राङ् षडङ्गयामितो जनः ॥ सः १६५ ॥

pattana. We saw how the keen rivalry between Gujarat and Mālava, and their rulers Bhīma and the famous literary king Bhoja was not only political but keenly intellectual also. We also saw how the poets and dialecticians from different parts of India used to visit this capital of Gurajara–deṣa where their literary and dialectical talents were put to test.

Tarka, Sāhitya and Lakshaṇa – Logic and the Art of Dialectics, Literature and Poetics, Grammar and the Philosophy of Language–were the subjects affected by the cultured citizens of Aṇahillapura and proficiency in these subjects was a pass–port to the royal courts and the assemblies of the learned. The chaityas and the Maṭhas of different sects, in fact, were the academies and the colleges where these subjects were discussed and taught. We referred to the great dialectician Ṣantisūri who had thirtytwo students studying under him Pramaṇa-ṣāstra which included the Buddhist logic whose 'categories were difficult to grasp.' * This atmosphere of learning, of public debates, and of literary criticism as also of literary compositions was a significant feature of the times which became more and more marked with the spread of political power of Aṇahillapura. We saw that when Jayasimha built his famous lake, he also built Maṭhas – something like residential colleges –

---

* From the following passage of the M. K. C. we learn that the works of Kaṇāda, Akshapāda, Uddyotakara, Vāchaspati and Udayana were being studied in Gujerat. Incidentally it also shows Vādī Devasūri's mastery of the works of these authors.

महर्षिः—देव ! अद्य श्री देवसूरेः प्रामाणिकमनोहारिणीं वाणीमाकर्ण्य विशीर्णः कणादाक्षपादभणितौ पक्षपातः, उद्विग्नमुद्योतकरोक्तावन्तःकरणं, अरुचिगोचरतामचरद् वाचस्पतिमतिः, दग्धमिवावभात्युदयनवैदग्ध्यम् । (p. 49).

provided with almost all the then known branches of learning, round about the precincts. As we saw, the descriptions of the city by the D. K. and other contemporary and later works point to a high state of literary development. It was in this intellectual milieu that Hemachandra, the greatest intellectual of the age lived and did his work. He must have received immense benefit and impetus from such an environment, but he must have also found it very difficult to shine out amongst such a galaxy of learned men. This, probably, explains his tremendous literary output– encyclopaedic in its scope and accurate in detail.

When Hemachandra came on the scene many learned men of different religious persuasions had played or were playing their parts. We shall note some of these – as it will help us in forming an idea of the intellectual company which Hemachandra joined.

Some of the learned men of the times of Karṇa and even Bhima I, it appears, were living in the early part of Jayasimha's reign, though for want of chronological information, we cannot exactly name them.

We mentioned the two learned Brāhmaṇas of Madhya – deṣa, Ṣrīdhara and Ṣrīpati known after their conversion to Jaina faith, as Jineṣvara and Buddhisāgara who were responsible, through the good offices of Someṣvara the Purohita and Jnānadeva the great Saiva Pontiff, in getting a footing in Anahillapura for the Suvihita monks of the Ṣvetāmbara Jaina sect in teeth of opposition from the powerful and influential Chaitya–vāsins. We referred to the Samskṛta grammar composed by Buddhisāgara and known after him. Jineṣvara wrote

a work on Pramāṇaśāstra + We also referred to the dialectical powers of Śantisūri, bearing the titles of Kavīndra and Vādichakravartin received from Bhīma, and that of Vādivetāla from Bhoja. He held controversies with the Kaula poet and dialectician Dharma of Bhṛgukachha who in his turn showed his mastery of that dialectical work the Tattvopaplava, and also with a Dravidian logician. We also saw that Sāntisurī had in addition to his thirtytwo students, one more student – more brilliant than his thirtytwo named Muni Chandra of the Suvihita type. This Muni Chandra became a master - logician who trained the famous Vādi Devasūri–the author of the Pramāṇanaya-tattvālokālaṃkāra and its commentary the Syādvāda-ratnākara–, and who defeated the famous Digambara dialectician Kumudachandra in an open debate held under the chairmanship of Jayasimha himself in his court. We shall refer to this incident later on.

We also referred to Abhayadeva known as Navāngī - ṭīkākāra. The visit of the Kāṣhmiri poet Bilhaṇa to Aṇahillapura, though of a short duration, is very significant. It is suggestive of the literary contact between Gujarāt and Kāshmīra, and must have something to do with the ambition of Hemachandra to propitiate the Goddess of Learning who resided in Kāshmira (काश्मीरवासिनीं देवीम्).

+ The following interesting information is given by JineŚvara at the end of his Pramāṇalakshṇa (Purātattva Vol. IV, pp. 83 – 84) :—

शब्दलक्ष्म प्रमालक्ष्म यदेतेषां न विद्यते ।
नादिमन्तस्ततो ह्येते परलक्ष्मोपजीविनः ॥
श्रीबुद्धिसागराचार्यैर्वृत्तैर्व्याकरणं कृतं ।
अस्माभिस्तु प्रमालक्ष्म वृद्धिमायातु साम्प्रतम् ॥

According to the Pr. Ch., Govinda sūri who was the teacher of Sūrācharya was living in the reign of Jayasimha also. If it were so, it must be in the early part of Jayasimha's reign and even then he must have been very old indeed. This Govindasūri is referred to as the teacher of Vīrācharya who was a friend of Jayasimha. It is more likely, however, that some other teacher, who must have been a student of Govindāchārya and therefore in the line known after the famous teacher, is referred to.

In the course of a friendly conversation, narrates the Pr. Ch., Jayasimha told Vīrācharya that the greatness of the learned men depended upon the royal recognition. Vīrāchārya's self-respect was wounded and so he wanted to leave the city of Aṇahillapura. Jayasimha tried to stop him from going, but according to the Pra. Ch., he flew away to Pāli in Marwad using his Yogic powers. Jayasimha repented and requested him to return which he did after an extensive tour in different parts of India, in course of which he defeated several dialecticians – especially Buddhists in Mahābodhapura. He was highly honoured by the king of Gwalior also.

A dialectician of the Sāmkhya school named Vādi Simha – this looks more like a title than a proper name – visited Aṇahillapura and challenged the learned men of the city to meet him in public debate. Jayasimha, who was very jealous of the honour of his kingdom in matters of learning, approached Govindāchārya who sent his pupil Vīrācharya to fight him. We do not know whether this debate took place before Vīrācharya left Aṇahillapura or after he

returned; because the order in narrating events adopted by the Pr. Cha. is not always chronological.

It is more likely that Vīrācharya might have met the Sāṃkhya dialectician before he left Aṇahillapura; in fact the power of debate that Vīrāchārya showed, might have been the cause of his intimacy with Jayasiṃha.

Vīrāchārya also defeated in debate one Kamalakīrti a Digambara dialectician. The Pr. Cha. gives no dates about him (pp. 272 - 277).

Deva Sūri or Vādi Deva Sūri – Devasuri the Dialectician as he became known – was one of the great masters of Logic and Dialectics whose activities were spread in the reigns of Siddharaja Jayasimha and Kumārapāla. He belonged, as we saw, to that school of great logicians of Muni Chadra sūri and his teacher Sāntīsūri, who himself, as we saw, was a student of Abhayadevasūri – the author of that great philosophical work known as Tattavabodhavidhāyiṇī or more significantly Vāda Mahārṇava – the Ocean of Dialectics – in the form of a commentary on the Sanmatitarka of Siddhasena Divākara. * The praises bestowed on Devasūri by contemporary learned men like Devabodha of the Bhāgavata sect and Hemachandra himself and the dramatist Yaṣaschandra as well as later logicians like Yaṣovijaya, are, we find, not unfounded when we study Devasuri's Pramāṇa-naya-tattvāloka and his Syādvādaratnākara. In his own days, especially, in the early part of his career,

* This work has been edited by Pandit Sukhlal and Pandit Bechardas and published in five volumes by the Gujarat Puratattva Mandir, Ahmedabad.

he became famous as a great debater who silenced several dialecticians especially the great Digambara dialectician Kumudachandra. This defeat of Kumudachandra was a sort of land-mark in the history of Ṣvetāmbara Jainas. As a verse attributed to Hemachandra says there would have been no Ṣvetāmbaras in Gujarat if Devasūri had not defeated Kumudachandra who had, according to the conditions of the debate, to leave this province. This incident, as we saw, forms the subject-matter of the play of Yaṣaṣchandra known as the " Mudritakumudachandra or Kumudachandra Silenced".

This play is a sort of contemporary account which gives many interesting details about the intellectual life in the reign of Siddharāja Jayasimha. The Pra. Cha. in its chapter on Vādi Devasūri mainly draws upon this work and supplements its information from other sources. From these two works, we get accurate information about the main events of Devasūri's life.

From the Pra. Cha. we learn that Devasūri was born in the year V. S. 1143 A. D. 1087 (p. 295. v. 286), that his father's name was Vīranāga who belonged to the Prāgvāṭa family, that his mother's name was Jinadevī, that originally they were of Maddāhṛta in the district of Ashṭādaṣaṣatī (modern Madhar in Palanpur State) and that the wordly name of Devasūri was Pūrṇachandra. The family preceptor was the famous Muni Chandrasūri. On account of an epidemic, Vīrangāga had to leave his native place and migrate to Bhṛgukachha in Lāṭa, where it appears he had to live in poor circumstances. In his ninth year (V. S. 1152–A. D. 1096) Purṇachandra was ordained monk by Muni Chandra

sūri (pp. 279 and 295) and was first given the name of Rāmachandra. Rāmachandra soon mastered 'Tarka, Lakshaṇa and Sāhitya, became a touch-stone in the current schools of philosophy - his own and those of others :

तर्कलक्षणसाहित्यविद्यापारगतः स च ।
अभूत् स्वपरसिद्धान्ते वर्तमाने कषोपलः ॥ ३८ ॥' (p. 280).

Then Rāmachandra began his career as a dialectician. In Dholaka he defeated a dialectician named Bandha of the Ṣivādvaita school (v. 39 p. 280 Pr. ch.). According to the M. K. C., however, it was Munichandrasūri - Devasūri's guru - who defeated the Saiva dialectician who is described there as surpassing both Bṛhaspati and Ṣukrāchārya (p. 17 v. 10). It may be that Devasūri might have taken prominent part in helping his guru in the debate with this powerful Saivādvaita dialectician.

The Pra. Cha., then, refers to Devasūri's meeting Kāṣmirasāgara in Satyapura (or Sachor in Marwada), Guṇachandra the Digambara in Nāgapura (or Nagor in Marawada), Ṣivabhūta [°ti] of the Bhāgavata school in Chitrakūṭa (or Chitod), Gangādhara in Gopagiri (or Gwalior), Dharaṇidhara in Dhārā, Padmākara in Pushakariṇī and Kṛshṇa - the leader of Brāhmaṇas- in Bhṛgukshetra (p. 210 vs. 39 - 41). How much of this statement is historical - we cannot say, as we have no other corroborative evidence. But the defeat of Guṇachandra the Digambara is corroborated by the M. K. C. (pp. 16 & 25). According to the play, this debate was held in the court of Arṇorāja of Sapādalaksha whose protègé the play-wright Yaṣaschandra was. This event took place before his famous debate

with Kumudachandra and probably was responsible for Kumudachandra's challenge to Devasūri for a dialectical duel, though we have no definite information on the point.

The Pra. Cha. mentions six learned friends of Devasūri viz:- Vimalachandra, Harichandra, Somachandra, Pārṣvachandra, Ṣānti and Aṣokachandra (p. 280). There is corrobarative evidence to prove the historicity of these persons in several Jain works of Gujarat. The M. K. C. mentions one Aṣoka as a follower of Devasūri (p. 13). May not Somachandra be our Hemachandra who bore that name before he became an Āchārya ?

After Rāmachandra was thus qualified, he was made a Sūri or Āchārya. * This ceremony took place in the year V. S. 1174-A. D. 1118 that is when he was in his thirtyfirst year (p. 295). He was thenceforth called Devasūri.

Devasūri was first introduced to Jayasimha through the minister Ambāprasāda who appears to be himself a philosopher as he is referred to by Devasūri in his logical treatise. The occasion was, as usual, dialectical. One 'Devabodha of Ṣrī Bhāgavatadarṣana' visited 'Srīmat Pattana' and challenged the learned men of the city to explain a verse which he wrote down on a leaf and hung it at the royal gate. For six months it remained unexplained; then Ambāprasāda introduced Devasūri to the king. Devasūri explained the verse in the presence of the king, who, from that day, became his friend (p. 281 P. C.). Devabodha

* We cannot definitely say whether all these dialectical conquests of Devasūri were acheived before he became Āchārya.

also became a great admirer and friend of Devasūri. Acting on Devasūri's advice, a rich man named Bāhaḍa× built a temple in honour of the last Tirthankara – Mahāvīra Vardhamāna.

In the year V. S. 1171–A. D. 1115 Devasūri's guru Munichandrasūri died, most prabably in Anahillapura. Devasūri became the head of his group and school.

When Devasūri went to Nāgapura – Nagor – Devabodha happened to be there. Devabodha greatly praised Devasūri * before the king Āhlādana who consequently received him with great honour.

In the year V. S. 1181–A. D. 1125, the Kumudachandra debate took place. This formidable Digambara dialectician was, according to the Pra. Cha. a southerner and the guru of Jayakeśin – king of Karṇāṭaka and the maternal grand father of Jayasimha Siddharāja. He had defeated several dialecticians whose marionettes he used to tie to his left foot as so many tokens of dialectical conquests. He is represented to be the very incarnation of pride (p. 283. P. C.). In the M. K. C., Kumudachandra himself narrates his own exploits. His opponents included Buddhists, Bhāṭṭa Mīmāmsakas, followers of Ṣankara, and Kāpilas that is Sāmkhyas. How much historical truth there is in this narration we cannot say. We know, however, that these schools of philosophy flourished in the south and that Digambara

× This Bāhaḍa was not the son of Udayana, nor the author of Vāgbhaṭālamkāra. This is some other person. Many Bāhaḍas are known.

* The praise of Devabodha is as follows:—

यो वादिनो द्विजिह्वान् साटोपं विषममानमुद्गिरतः ।
शमयति सदैवसूरिर्नरेन्द्रवन्द्यः कथं न स्यात् ॥

Pra. Cha. v. 76 p. 283).

Jainism was then rich in philosophers and dialectcians of a very high order, some of whose works have survived to this day.

It was in Āṣāpalli (– the older name of Karṇāvatī, and the modern Ahmedabad –) that the seeds of discord between Kumudachandra and Devasūri were sown. Both of them were staying for the monsoon in that city, This must be the monsoon of the year V. S. 1180–A. D. 1124. According to the M. K. C., Devasūri, at first, did not mind the vauntings of Kumudachandra and rather tried to practice the 'Ṣama' or 'control of anger' which was his religious duty to do. But his correligionists and disciples would not put up with the boastings of this naked dialectician when they had a man like Devasūri with them. So when an old nun was harrassed by Kumudachandra, Devasūri was roused to fight and so he sent word to the Jaina sangha of Aṇahillapura. Aṇahillapura welcomed his suggestion, and Devasūri sent an invitation to Kumudachandra to meet him in the court of Siddharāja Jayasimha which the latter readily accepted. It appears there were many machinations from both the sides to prejudice the issue. Devasūri, however, strictly forbade his party to try underhand means and even though, at first, he had some difficulty with the minister Gāngila, he got a fair hearing in the court of Jayasimha.

" Both the protagonist and antagonist were called to the debating hall " says the Pra. Cha., " on the full-moon-day of Vaiṣākha. V. S. 1181–A. D. 1125 (v. 193, p. 290). We are not told whether this was the first or the last day of the debate. The questions at issue were whether souls in feminine incarnation could

liberate themselves and so also whether monks who put on clothes. The Ṣvetāmbara dialectician maintained that women could liberate themselves, as liberation depended upon a person possessing 'sattva' and women were known to possess 'great sattva.' Instances were quoted from the Ṣāstras, of Sīta and others, and as contemporary evidence the name of the queen mother Mayaṇallā was mentioned, who, from the way in which she is referred, appears to be living at the time. This debate is merely referred to by the M. K. C. but described in detail by the Pra. Cha.. The debate lasted for sixteen days and at last Kumudachadra was silenced, who as a last resource tried to find a grammatical fault in the word Koṭākoṭī that Devasūri had used. The judges, however. held that the usage was quite according to Pāṇini. We are told that Devasūri used his knowledge of the commentary of Ṣāntisūri on the Uttarādhyayanasūtra bearing on this topic and defeated Kumudachandra who could not answer his arguments. (P. C. pp. 283-293 M. K. C. pp. 44 - 51).

In this connection the M. K. C. supplies us with very good information about the learned assembly of Jayasimha. + The king himself was the chairman whose decision was final. He was assited by four sabhyas (members of assembly) – in the words of Pratihāra– '**Maharshi** who was learned in Tarka, Bhārata and Parāṣara (Logic, Mahābhārata and the Smṛti of Pārāṣara.), **Utsāha** whose learning had become famous

+ This informarion is further supplemented by the eighth and the last chapter of the P. N. T. L. of Devasūri which discusses the nature of Vāda, Vādin, Sabhya and Sabhāpati.

in Ṣaradādeṣa (i. e. Kasmir), **Sāgara** – the ocean of wonderful intelligence and **Rāma** learned in Logic and Dialectics. On the side of Devasūri were the 'poet laureate Ṣripāla and Bhābhū–a man of wonderful genius '. On the side of Kumudachandra were the ' three Keṣavas '. The general Silānka and at first the minister Gāngila were, somehow, against, Devasūri.

Unfortunately we have no other information about these learned people. Utsāha, we know from the part he plays in the drama, was a grammarian. He must be the same man as was sent from Kashmir with the eight grammars for Hemachandra.

The learned assembly of Siddharāja is compared by Devasūri to the divine assembly of Indra known as Sudharmā Sabhā. The poet Ṣrīpāla says ' one can remain proud of his proficiency in Grammar, Poetry and Poetics, and Logic and Dialectics as long as one has not visited the Assembly of Jayasimha.' +

The Pra. Cha. quotes a verse attributed to Hemachandra which we have already referred to. It is, however, not explicit on the point whether Hemachandra was actually present in the assembly.

+" देवसूरिः—कश्चाय स्वसभया पराजितायां सुधर्मायां सुधास्पर्धानुबन्धो धराधीश्वरस्य। किं नालोक्यन्तेऽनेकचतुराननाः। किं न परिस्फुरन्ति गणनातिक्रान्ता गिरीशाः। किं न लक्षीक्रियन्ते पुण्डरीकाक्षाः। किं न जृम्भन्ते भूरिशो जिष्णवः। किं नोल्लसन्ति बहवो राजहंसाः। किं न विलसन्ति सहस्रशो भूतनयबुधाः। किं न प्रगल्भायन्ते मध्येसुधर्माधिकृतो मन्त्रिणः।

कविः [श्रीपालः]—भगवन् ईदृगेव गुर्जरेश्वरस्य सभा। तथा हि

तावद् व्याकरणप्रवीणभणितिः [तेः] प्रागल्भ्यमुज्जृम्भते
तावत् काव्यविचारभारधरणे धीरायते धुर्यता।
तावत् तर्ककथानुबन्धविषमे बद्धाभिलाषं मनो
यावन्नो जयसिंहदेवसदसि प्रेक्षावतामागमः ॥

According to the P. C., however, Hemachandra accompained Devasūri to the debate. Probably he was there either in the capacity of a junior counsel on the side of Devasūri or merely as a curious spectator of the show.

Jayasimha being greatly pleased with the success of Devasūri presented him with a big sum of money which, however, the latter being a Suvihita, did not accept. The money was spent in building a temple at the suggestion of the minister Āṣuka, in which the idol of the first Tirthamkara was istalled by four Sūris - Devasuri being presumably one of them - in the year V. S. 1183-A. D. 1127.

Devasūri's magnum opus was a treatise on logic known as Pramāṇanaya - tattvālokālamkāra and the commentary on it known as Syādvāda-ratnākara. He was helped in this work by two of his students Bhadreṣvara and Ratnaprabha. He wrote several other works and left a number of learned pupils - of which Māṇikya, Aṣoka, and Vijayasena are mentioned in the M. K. C.+

Vādi Devasūri died at the ripe old age of 83 years in the year V. S. 1226-A. D. 1170 in the reign of Kumārapāla.

We may, here, say something, about Devabodha and Ṣrīpāla, both of whom were great favourites of Siddharāja though their mutual relationship was anything but friendly. Probably they were jealous of each other for the royal favour.

+ See the Samskṛta introduction of Muni Himanṣuvijaya to P. N. T. L.

We learn from the autobiographic verse + of Ṣrīpāla in the Vadanagara praṣasti of Kumārapāla that he was famed for composing a great prabandha (literary composition) in a day, that he was accepted as a brother by Ṣrī Siddharāja and that he was called Kavichakravartin - king of poets. * This verse is quoted in the P. C. and other works whenever Ṣrīpāla is referred to. From the diction of this praṣasti whose author he was, we can say, that he must have been a poet of no inconsiderable merit. We have seen that he is one of the characters of the contemporary play M. K. C.. From that play, we also gather that he was a friend of Siddharāja from childhood, the very essence of good poetry and bearing the title of Kavirāja. We also learn from it that he was blind. × He is called Thakkura Ṣrīpāla by the Pratihara in the play. The verses put in his mouth in the play are really fine - and it may be that some of these may really be Ṣrīpāla's.

From an inscription on an image in the temple of Vimala on Mount Abu, we learn that the poet Ṣrīpāla belonged to the Prāgvāṭa family and that his

---

+ एकाहनिष्पन्नमहाप्रबन्धः श्रीसिद्धराजप्रतिपन्नबन्धुः ।
श्रीपालनामा कविचक्रवर्ती प्रशस्तिमेतामकरोत् प्रशस्ताम् ॥

* अये कथं सिद्धभूपालबालमित्रं सूत्रं सुकवितायाः, कविराजबिरुदकमलनालं श्रीपालमालोकयामः ।

× कविः—पातुं नेत्राञ्जलिभिस्त्वद्रूपरसायनं विधिहतस्य ।
श्रीदेवसूरिसुगुरोर्नाभङ्गुरमस्ति मे भाग्यम् ॥

दे.—कवीश्वर! अप्रतिकार्योऽयं पुराकृतासकृतपरिपाकः, परं कृतैव भगवत्या भारत्या त्वयि त्रिलोकाकलनकौशलजुषः सारस्वतचक्षुषो वितरणेन करुणा ॥ (p. 39 the M. K. P.).

father's name was Ṣrī Lakshmaṇa. + In all likelihood the image represents the poet.

We find confirmation of these facts from the Kumārpāla-pratibodha of Somaprabhasūri which was finished in the year V.S. 1241-A. D. 1186 about 11 years after the death of Kumārapāla. It also tells us that Srīpāla belonged to the Prāgvāṭa family and he was addressed as 'Kavīndra' and 'Brother' by Ṣrī Siddhapati. ×

The Pra. Cha. tells us that when Devabodha contemptuously asked as to who that blind fellow was, Jayasimha himself introduced the poet. From this work we learn also that Ṣrīpāla had written praṣastis for Rudra-Mahālaya and Durlabha Sarovara the same as Sahasra-linga and a great Prabandha-composition-known as Vairochanaparājaya probably a play. The praṣastis must have been similar to the Vadanagar-praṣasti. Some verses of the lake praṣasti are quoted in the P. C. and, as we noted, a slab forming the part of the Kīrtīstambha of the lake bearing on it a fragment of the praṣasti has been discovered. Stray verses of Ṣrīpāla also have been found. * From such fragmentary poems, we cannot

+ See Muni Jinvijaya's Introduction to the play Draupadi Svayamvara of Vijayapāla grand son of Ṣrīpāla pp. 7-22.

× प्राग्वाटान्वयसागरेन्दुरसमप्रज्ञः कृतज्ञः क्षमी
वाग्मी सूक्तिसुधानिधानमजनि श्रीपालनामा पुमान् ।
यं लोकोत्तरकाव्यरञ्जितमतिः साहित्यविद्यारतिः
श्रीसिद्धाधिपतिः 'कवीन्द्र' इति च भ्रातेति च व्याहरत् ॥
[कु. प्रति बोध (प्रशस्ति) पृ. ४७७.]

* See Jinavijaya's Introduction to Draupadī Swayamvara. A hymn called Srī Chaturvinṣatijinastavanam attributed to Srīpāla is published in the Jaina-stotra-samdoha. p. 121.

form any correct estimate of Ṣrīpāl's poetic abilities; we can, however, say from them that all his verses are marked by chaste and forceful diction.

For Devabodha of the Bhāgavata sect, our main source of information is again the Pra. Cha. The references to Devabodha in later prabandhas are more or less confused. The Pra. Cha. generally refers to him with great respect.

Devabodha who is called a 'Mahāvidvān,' 'a great savant' when he came to Aṇahillapura, in the begining, showed great indifference towards the king. He had, however, placed at the royal gate his enigmatic verse for the learned men of Aṇahillapura to explain. We saw that after six months, Devasūri solved the ENIGMA. This made Devabodha an admirer of Devasūri. But probably before the riddle was solved Devabodha did not care to go to the court of Jayasimha. After consulting Ṣrīpāla his poet laureate Jayasimha sent a messenger to request Devabodha to come to his court, which, however, the latter refused to do and asked the king to go to him if he wanted to see him. " I have seen rulers of Kānykubja and Kāṣi. What do I care for the ruler of Gurjars whose dominion is so small? If your ruler, however, wants to see me, let him come here, and sit on the ground while I shall be sitting on a lion-seat". (v. 191-193, p. 30ā-8). This was the reply of Devabodha. Jayasimha was impressed with the man's attitude and so went to see him with Ṣrīpāla. In this visit Devabodha referred to Ṣrīpāla in very contemptuous terms and even when Jayasimha personally informed him of his poet laureate's achievements Devabodha showed scant respect for the blind poet

with a verse of biting sarcasm.* This must have been the origin of antagonism between these two literators. Then followed what may be described as a poetic passage of arms between Devabodha and Śrīpāla.

Devabodha must have come to Aṇahillapura about V. S. 1178-A. D. 1122 when Devasuri returned from Arbuda mountain, knowing that his Guru Munichandrasūri would die within six months. He solved the riddle of Devabodha after his return from Abu.

Soon after in V. S. 1178, Munichandrsuri died. Before V. S. 1181, Devabodha and Devasūri again met at Nāgāpura or (Nagora) where before the king Āhlādana Devabodha praised Devasuri with a verse of āryā metre. It may be that Devabodha might have immediately returned to Aṇahiliapura or more probably he might have visited Kāṣi and Kānya-Kabja before he again came to Gujarata. In that case the incident with Śripāla must refer to the second visit. We saw that after the defeat of Kumudachandra, a temple was built with the money which was to be presented to Devasūri. This temple was finished in V. S. 1183-A. D. 1127. On that occasion, the Pra. Cha. tells us, Devabodha was invited to take part in the festival by Devasūri with great joy because he was a worthy person × (pp. 309-310 vs. 222-224). Devabodha came and showed his great poetic gift by reciting a fine verse as Jayasimha came to the Jaina temple from the Saiva

* शुक्रः कवित्वमापन्नः एकाक्षिविकलोऽपि सन् ।
चक्षुर्द्वयविहीनस्य युक्ता ते कविराजता ॥ p. 308, v. 208.

× देवबोधोऽपि सत्पात्र तत्राहूयतः हर्षतः ॥

temple.* He also showed his miraculous power by making a buffalo-driver who was fetching water from a lake and whose education consisted of two syllables 'Tha-ja,' compose and recite a poem as if he were a learned man, by simply putting his hand on the man's head.

Ṣrīpāla put a watch on Devabodha's activities and found out that he was not quite the ascetic he pretended to be. But he did not succeed in discrediting Devabodha in Jayasimha's eyes, and when Devabodha wanted to leave Jayasimha to his 'vulgar assembly,' (ईदृग्ग्राम्यनटग्रामे संयोगः सदृशोऽस्तु वः । २६८) it was with great difficulty that he was persuaded to stay. Within three years, however, Devabodha became vey poor.

Hemachandra had come to know of this quarrel. He, however, fully knew the worth of Devabodha. In Hemachandra's opinion, 'in these days, there is no learning except in this man' × Devabodha also fully knew the worth of Hemachandra and when he came for a visit, he paid to Hemachandra the compliment which he alone knew how to pay. + Hemachandra succeeded in making Ṣrīpāla and Devabodha friends; for as the Pra. Cha. says, 'it is the first duty of the ascetics to pacify quarrels.' ·|· At the suggestion of the poet-laureate

---

* एको रागिषु राजते प्रियतमादेहार्धहारी हरो
नीरागेषु जिनो विमुक्तललनासंगो न यस्मात्परः ।
दुर्वारस्मरघस्मरोरगविषव्यासंगमूढो जनः
शेषः कामविडम्बितो न विषयान् भोक्तुं न मोक्तुं क्षमः ॥

× दृश्यते नान्यसामान्यं संक्रामितगुणोत्तरम् ।
सारस्वतं न कुत्रापि समयेऽस्मिन्नमुं विना ॥ २८८ ॥

+ पातु वो हेमगोपालः कम्बलं दण्डमुद्वहन् ।
षड्दर्शनपशुग्रामं चारयन् जैनगोचरे ॥

आद्यो धर्मो व्रतस्थानां विरोधोपशमः खलु ॥

Jayasimha gave a lac to Devabodha who settled his debts with the money. Then that Mahāmati, as the Pra. Cha. calls him, retired to the banks of the Ganges and passed his life in meditation.

In this context, we may also mention Bhāva Bṛhaspati whose life is described in the inscription in the Bhadrakāli temple at Prabhāsa Pattana dated Valabhi samvat 850 = V. S. 1230–A. D. 1174.

Bhāva Bṛhaspati was born in Vārāṇasi in Kānyakubja district in a great Brāhmaṇa family. He made it the mission of his life to revive Śaivism of the Paṣupata school. For this purpose he left his native place and took to travelling. As the inscription says " For the purposes of pilgrimage, making kings devout, and protect religious places, this ocean of austerities went out" (v. 6). First he went to Dhārā where he made the Pramāra kings his disciples. Then he came to Jayasimha who looked upon him as his brother. Bhāva Bṛhaspati reminded Jayasimha of his (Jayasimha's) mission of life viz. to revive old places of Siva worship. The king on the very day made him a Mahattara and an Āchārya. After Jayasimha's death, Kumārapāla made him a 'gaṇḍa' that is the officer in charge of Somanātha Pattaṇa and rebuilt the whole temple under Bṛhaspati's supervision. The rest of the inscription describes how Gaṇḍa Bhāva Bṛhaspati revived the glory of Somanātha by building temples, wells, etc..

Two other literary men of Jayasimha's time should also be mentioned. One is Paṇḍita Vardhamānasūri–the author of the Gaṇaratnamahodadhi which was finished in the year V. S. 1197–A. D. 1141. He calls himself a pupil of Ṣri Govindasūri who probably is the same

as we have referred to; – the teacher of many worthy pupils. This Gaṇaratnamahodadhi is a work on grammar unique in its subject matter.

The other is the author of Vāgbhaṭālamkāra a work on poetics. This Vāgbhaṭa is often confused with the minister Vāgbhaṭa. But the two are different. The minister Vāgbhaṭa was a son of Udayana while our author is a son of Soma as he himself says in a verse in this work. He was also a Jaina.

This work seems to have been finished between the conquest of Mālava and Jayasimha's death, for, it refers to the conquest of Mālava and has no verse in praise of Kumārapāla. It must have, therefore, been composed between V. S. 1192 and V. S. 1199–A. D. 1136–1143. Thus it was composed at the time when Hemachandra might have been composing his Anuṣāsanas. The Kāvyānuṣāsana refers to Vāgbhaṭa.

Another contemporary who also wrote upon Poetics may be mentioned. His name is Maṇikyachandra Āchārya, the second commentator on the Kāvyaprakāṣa of Mammaṭa and the first commentator outside Kāṣmira. His commentary is known by the name of Saṃketa. It is one of the best commentaries, written in excellent style, on the K. P. * The commentary was finished in the year V. S. 1216-A.D.1160 month Mādhava (Chaitra), according to the colophon at the end of the commentary.

This Māṇikyachandra belonged to the line of Ṣilabhadrasūri; the name of his direct preceptor was Ṣri Sāgareudu alias Sāgrāchandra. This Māṇikyachandra is not to be confused with a pupil of Vādi Devasūri of that name.

---

* See Prof. R. B. Athavale's article on 'Māṇikyachandra' in Puratattva Vol. I. pp. 181–187.

III

The Life and the Works of Hemachandra

18

The main problems in connection with the life of Hemachandra have been critically considered by the late Dr. Bühler in his learned monograph on the subject published in 1889 at Vienna

No student of Hemchandra's life can afford to neglect the study of this fine piece of research. In fact this monograph has been largely drawn upon by scholars for information regarding the life of Hemachandra.

The publication of some new material and a re-examination of the sources used by that learned scholar, however, make it necessary to reconsider the whole question and revise some of his opinions. It will not be possible, however, in this introduction, to discuss all the questions in detail. *

Dr. Bühler used the following four works:—

(1) The Prabhāvakacharita of Prabhāchandrasūri completed in the year V. S. 1334–A. D. 1278.

(2) The Prabandhachintāmaṇi of Merutunga.

(3) The Prabandhakoṣa of Rājaśekhara.

(4) The Kumārapāla Prabandha of Jinamaṇḍana Upādhyaya.

The two Dvyāsrayas, the Prasaśti to the Siddha Hema, and the Mahaviracharita from the Trisasht-iṣalākāpurushacharita – Hemchandra's own works – were also used by him.

---

* See the Preface pp. IX–XI to the English translation of Dr. Bühler's Life of Hemachandra published in the Singhi Jaina Series.

To these sources we are able to add three more works: (1) the Kumārapālapratibodha of Somaprabha-sūri and his Satāratha Kāvya: (2) the Moharājaparājaya of Yaṣahpāla and (3) the Purātana-prabandha Samgrah. Of these three – the first two are works of authors contemporary to Hemachandra: while the last as we have seen, is a compilation supplying many details

The Kumārapālapratibodha is, then, our main contemporary authority for information regarding Hemachandra. But the author, frankly, confesses that though there is much else that is interesting in the lives of these two great men (viz: Hemachandra and Kumārapāla), he has only touched that part which pertains to the inculcation of Jainadharma. 'For this,' he says, 'he should not be blamed, for a man may choose from a kitchen full of many eatables, only that which he likes' (p. 3, K. Pra. G. O. S.). This means that though we shall have to examine the later sources in the light of information derived from this work, there will remain many gaps in the life-story of Hemachandra to fill which we will have to rely solely upon the later sources. Of these, as we shall find, the Pra. Cha. is comparatively more useful.

The Kumārapāla-pratibodha does not directly narrate the life-story of Hemachandra. The author provides a dramatic occasion for it. Kumārapāla is very anxious to know what true religion is and is not satisfied with what his Brahmaṇical preceptors tell him; for it involved killing of animals in sacrifices. The king is not able to sleep being much troubled in mind over the question. Then his minister Bāhaḍadeva (S't Vāgbhaṭadeva) bows to the king and makes his submission thus " Oh King! if you want to know the nature of dharma anda dharma

listen attentively, for a moment, to what I say." Then Bāhaḍa narrates the life-story of Hemachandra up to the time he is introduced to the king, beginning with the history of the Pūrṇatallagachchha to which Hemachandra belonged. This dramatic occasion has been regarded by the later prabandha-writers and even modern scholars, drawing upon them, as historical. An inference is made from this that this was the first occasion when Hemachandra was introduced to Kumārapāla. However it appears to me, that this prologue is purely imaginary created by the author to give a poetic touch to his narration.

The minister Bāhaḍa, after narrating the history of Purṇatalla gachchha, informs us that Devachandra sūri – the author of the Ṭhāṇa-vṛtti and the Ṣaṇtijiṇakathā comes to Dhandhuka in course of his usual itinerary. After Devachandra had finished his sermon a handsome looking boy who was hearing the sermon approaches him and requests him to help him 'cross this ocean of the world by giving him a boat in the form of Suchāritra (that is by making him a monk).' The guru asks the boy his and his father's names. Nemi–the maternal uncle of the boy–who was present there, gives the guru some information about the boy and his parents.

He says: 'Here, (i. e. in Dhandhukka) lives a prominent merchant of the name of Chachcha who worships (his) god and preceptors. He has a wife named Chāhiṇī who is my sister. This boy is their son. His name is Changadeva. * In these days, the

* After this, the dream that Chāhinī dreamt when this boy was conceived is narrated. This shows that Hemachandra was becoming a legendary figure in a work completed 12 years after his death. Chachcha belonged to the Moḍha community.

boy's mind does not delight in anything except dharma' (p. 21).

The guru - Devachandra - said "If the boy is initiated in the order, it would be nice. We shall take him and teach him the truth of all the Sāstras. He will do good to the people like a Tīrthamkara. So you ask his father Chachcha to permit him to enter the religious order.' (p. 21).

The father, out of affection for his son, does not give the necessary permission. But the boy was determined to become a monk, so he left his home, being encouraged by his maternal uncle. With his guru he came to Khambhatittha that is modern Cambay, and was ordained a monk there after satisfying the Sangha (or Congregation of laymen and monks). He was given the name of Somachanda (or Somachandra). After practising the Tapa (austerities) taught by the Jaina Āgamas "he crossed, within a short time, the whole ocean of learning." His guru Ṣrī Devachandra seeing that he possessed a number of qualities impossible to acquire in this iron age, established him in the position of a Gaṇadhara; that is he was made an Achārya and a leader of other monks. Because his body had the colour of gold, he was called Hemachandra (p. 22).

Hemachandra was moving about various provinces. But he was asked by a goddess not to go to other countries leaving Gurjara Vishaya (that is Gurjara country). "You will do great benefit by staying here." Obeying this divine order Hemachandra gave up going out to other countries, and lived in Gujarat preaching to (literally awakening) many people."

The minister continues the narrative : " It was to him (Hemachandra) that the world–famed Siddharāja the - crest jewel of the learned - used to ask all his doubts. It was the hearing of his sermons that made the mind of King Jayasimha like the dharma of Jinendra. Then Jayasimha made here (i. e. in Aṇahillapura) the beautiful temple known as Rājavihāra and the temple containing the idols of four Jinas known as Siddhavihāra in Siddhapura. At the suggestion of Jayasimhadeva, this lord of Munis composed the grammar known as Siddha–Hema, a work which is the treasure–house of the science of all languages (lit. words). Jayasimha was never satiated of hearing his nectar–like speech.

" So if you want to know the nature of dharma as it is, consult with devotion this best of the munis (p. 22).

Thus he was advised by his minister Bāhaḍa."

This brief account, in fact, gives the main events of Hemachandra's life and is, on the whole, reliable. The later accounts fill in the details. We shall, here, however, consider only those which are consistent with this account without entering into a detailed criticism of the rest.

The dates for the main events of Hemachandra's life are supplied by the Pra. Cha.. According to it, Hemachandra was born in the year V. S. 1145–A. D. 1089, full–moon night of Kārtika; he was initiated into the holy order in V. S. 1150–A. D. 1094, and was made a sūri or Āchārya in V. S. 1166–A. D. 1110 (p. 347 vs. 848–49).

On the date of Hemachandra's birth, there is unanimity in all the works. As to the date of his

initiation, however, there is some discrepancy. According to the injunction of the Jaina Ṣāstras, no person who has not completed his eighth year is legible for initiation into the Jaina holy order. We find that the P. C., the P. P. S., the Pra. Kosa and the K-Prabandha * say that when Hemachandra was initiated, he was about eight years old. The K-Prabandha gives the date of initiation as V. S. 1154-A. D. 1098 (p. 12). This seems to be correct. The discrepancy between the Pra. Cha. and the later accounts is easily explicable; and the K-Prabandha in a sense has done this. Devachandrasūri must have come to Dhandhukā in V. S. 1150, when his eyes were, first, cast on the boy Changadeva and his own formal consent also must have been taken at that time. Considerable time, however, must have elapsed before the necessary permission was obtained from his father Chachcha. We learn from the P. C. that Changadeva came with Devachandra to Karṇāvatī and was brought up with the sons of the minister Udayana-one of whom must be Bāhada or Vāgbhaṭa. After the father was appeased and satisfied, he gave his consent. According to the P. C., it was Chachha or Chāchiga, as it calls him, who performed the festival of initiation. This should be taken to mean that he was satisfied and must have been present on the occasion. It is likely that the invitations were also issued in his name. Somaprabha does not give the name of Udayana as the person who was responsible for the festive occasion; but later works give his name. This probably means that Udayana, who in V. S. 1154-A. D. 1098 must have been the officer in charge of Cambay must have paid all the expenses. According to the P. C.

Udayana had offered three lacs to Chachha, which, however, the latter had contemptuously refused to accept. So Udayana must have spent on the festive occasion a part of the money he was ready to offer to Chachha.

All these arrangements must have taken about three or four years to be completed. However that may be, it is certain that Hemachandra could not have been ordained before he was eight years old. So we may say that in V. S. 1150–A. D. 1094, Changadeva first came under the influence of Devachandra and his virgin mind untouched by wordly considerations was easily influenced; and in V. S. 1154–A. D. 1098, he gladly joined the holy order. One who is familiar with such happenings, even now, finds that these things do not happen soon and take considerable time. *

Another point which is not mentioned by Somaprabha may also be referred to here; and it is the religion of the parents of Changadeva. His mother Pāhiṇī and her brother Nemi were Jainas. But the father is called a 'Mithyātvin' – Jaina word for a non-Jaina – by the P. C. and other works. He appears to be a Māheṣvarin from his use of the word "Ṣiva – nirmālya" when he was offered money (The P. C. p. 83). There is nothing strange in this as we find that persons in those days of the same family followed different faiths. We saw that of the five sons of Ābhaḍa, two were Māheṣvarins (P. P. S. p. 33). This latitude in matters of faith should be borne in mind if we want to find

* Dr. Bühler's explanation of this matter is not acceptable to me as it is not based upon a proper understanding of the material and the custom in these matters. See pp. 6–8 & Notes p. 67, n. 17. S. J. S.

a proper explanation of the fact of persons of one faith praising the deities of other faiths.

As to the date of Hemachandra's 'Sūri-ship' there is no difference of opinion. The Pra. Cha., as we saw, gives the year V. S. 1166–A. D. 1110. So does the later K-prabandha (p. 13). Thus we find that Hemachandra became a member of the Jaina holy order at the age of eight and became a Sūri – a leader – at the age of twenty one. *

According to the K-prabandha the ceremony of 'Sūri-ship' took place in Nāgapura (Nagor) and the man who

* It may be interesting to compare these dates with those of some of Hemachandra's great contemporaries The dialectician Devasūri was Hemachandra's senior by two years being born in V. S. 1143–A. D. 1087; so also as a monk, Devasūri being initiated in V. S. 1152–A. D. 1096. Hemachandra, however, became Āchārya eight years before Devasūri, who was raised to that position, in the year V. S. 1174–A. D. 1118, when he was 31 years of age. At the time of the debate with Kumud-achandra, on the authority of the P. C. and the Pra. Cha., Hemachandra was in Aṇahillapura and present in the court. Hemachandra (aged 36), a junior in age, but senior as an Āchārya must have been of some help to Devasūri (aged 38). At the time Hemachandra was not so famous as Devasūri.

If Jayasimha was eight years old when he came to the throne in V. S. 1150–A. D. 1094, he would be older than Hemachandra by three years. Jayasimha became a king and Hemachandra became monk at the same age, both of them too young for the positions that they occupied. Both, however, discharged the duties of their respective stations in a manner few have done.

Hemachandra was older than Kumārapāla by four years, if we are right in putting the birth of Kumārapāla in V. S. 1149–A. D. 1093. The difference in age between the two, we may note, was not much.

paid the expenses was one Dhanada, a merchant of the place (p. 13).

In the life-story of a man of such extensive and extra-ordinary learning as Hemachandra, one would desire to know how he was educated, where he was educated and who were his teachers. Unfortunately, however, we have very little information on the point. In the K-pratibodha, we find Devachandrasūri saying to the maternal uncle of Changadeva that Changadeva after taking the vow, 'will go deep into the truth of all Śāstras.' After he took the vow, we are told, within a short time, he crossed the ocean of learning. After he became an Āchārya, he used to go out to other countries but he was asked to stay in Gujarat. This is all the information that the Ku-pratibodha gives.

Hemachandra himself says in the prasasti of the Trishashṭiśalākāpurushacharita, that he got all his learning through the favour of his Guru Devachandra (v. 15 तत्प्रसादादधिगतज्ञानसंपन्नमहोदयः।) But this does not carry us far in answering our questions.

The Pra. Cha. tells us that "Somachandra quickly became master of Tarka, Lakshaṇa and Sāhitya. But he was not satisfied with his capacity of retaining a hundred thousand padas in mind; so he took permission of his Guru to propitiate the goddess living in Kāsmīra-Kāṣmīradeśavāsinī. From Tāmralipti–that is Cambay –he started and put up for the night in a Jaina temple near by known as Śrī Raivatāvatāra. At midnight as he was sitting in meditation, the goddess Brāhmī appeared to him and asked him not to take the trouble of going all the way to Kāṣmīra, as she being satisfied with his devotion, would grant him what he desired.

After spending the night in her praises, in the morning Somachandra returned to his upāsraya - place of residence. Thus Soma became a Siddha - Sārasvata without any trouble " (Vs. 37-45). Then Soma was made a Sūri (48 - 59).

Jinamaṇḍana in his Ku-prabandha describes a similar event with more mystifying details.

Devachandra - the guru of Hemachandra-was no doubt a learned man But the question is whether he alone could have taught the various branches of learning whose mastery Hemachandra reveals in his works. Stambhatīrtha or Cambay, where Hemachandra appears to have passed his early years, was, no doubt, then an important port of India, and must have ample facilities for acquiring learning. But it is nowhere referred to as a centre of learning in the way Aṇahillapura is. It is likely that Somachandra might have studied for some time in Aṇahillapura, but we have no information to that effect.

The reference to Kāsmīravāsinī goddess, seems to me, to be of some significance. Somachandra, no doubt, wanted to go to Kāsmīra for further study. We know from Bilhaṇa what a great centre of learning Kāṣmira was in those days. But as the journey to Kāṣmira was, in those days, full of danger, the young scholar was advised not to go there. The appearance of the Kāsmira - vāsinī goddess may be interpreted as suggesting that Hemachandra had something to do with Kāsmira in matters of study.

We know from Bilhaṇa's sojourn in Aṇahillapura that Paṇḍitas from that land of Śāradā - as Kāsmira was called - used to come to Gujarāta. In the Assembly

of Jayasimha was a Paṇḍita named Utsāha who was a great grammarian and whose learning was even famous in Kāsmīra (See p. CCLIII).* It was this Utsāha who was sent again by the Kāśmīra panditas with the eight grammars from Kāśmīra, from which Hemachandra compiled his work. It will not be an altogether wild guess if I suggest that some of Hemachandra's teachers might have been Kāsmirian Panditas and even Utsāha may be one of them. The same suggestion is supported by the fact that the sūtras of the Kāvyānuśāsna are based upon the Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammata, and that, after discussing the theory of Rasa by quoting verbatim passages from the Nāṭyavedavivṛti, Hemachandra says in the Viveka in so many words "We follow Abhinavaguptapāda"; Abhinavagupta and Mammaṭa both of them were the luminaries of Kāśmīra in learning.

After Somachandra became Hemachandrasūri, his mother Pāhiṇī, we are told by the Pra. Cha., entered the holy order. At the request of Hemachandra she was seated on a simhasāna (seat of honour) – a rare honour to a nun due to her son's greatness (vs 61 – 63).

Now we come to the question as to when and how Hemachandra was first introduced to Jayasimha.

If we accept, on the authority of the P. C. (p. 67) and that of the Pra. Cha., that Hemachandra was present at the time of the Kumudachandra debate, we can say

* The fact that one of the earliest commentaries of Mammaṭa's Kāvyaprakāsa, viz:—the Samketa of Māṇikyachandra was composed in Gujarat confirms the fact that there was intimate contact between Gujarat and Kāsmira in matters of learning.

that he was introduced to the court of Jayasimha by the year V. S. 1181-A.D.1125 *. At that time Hemachandra would be 31 years of age. The Pra. Cha., however, tells us that after Hemachandra was ordained a Sūri, he went to Aṇahillapura (v. 64). Two questions arise in connection with the statement: Whether this was Hemachandra's first visit to the capital? and, how much time must have elapsed after his Sūri-ceremony before he reached the capital? We have no means to answer these questions definitely.

The first meeting of Hemachandra and Jayasimha is described thus : When Siddharāja seated on his elephant was going out for his usual outing (known as Rājapāṭī) through the city he saw Hemachandra standing aside near a shop. He stopped the elephant near a mound and asked the sūri to say something. Hemachandra uttered a verse: 'Oh Siddha! let your majestic elephant move fearlessly. The Diggajas (Elephants of Directions) might tremble. Don't mind them, for, you bear (the burden) of the earth.'+ The king, who was intelligent enough, understood the meaning and was pleased with the compliment. He asked Hemachandra to see him in the afternoon for diversion (vs. 65-69).

Thus on the authority of the Pra. Cha., which there is no sufficient reason to doubt, these two remarkable men of the age-one a king and the other a monk-got into touch with each other. The contact

---

* If the account of the K-prabandha of the first meeting of Kumārapāla and Hemachandra when the former waited upon Jayasimha, is true, we must imagine Hemachandra to be in Aṇahillapura even earlier than V. S. 1181.

+ कारय प्रसरं सिद्ध हस्तिराजमशङ्कितम् ।
त्रस्यन्तु दिग्गजाः किं तैर्भूस्त्वयैवोद्धृता यतः ॥

must have soon developed into intimacy and mutual admiration. The meeting of two such men could not but be of great consequence. The next occasion of their meeting that is referred to in the Pr. Cha. is the return of the conquering hero after subjugating Mālava, when representatives of different sects gathered to congratulate the king. Hemachandra, who was also there representing the Jaina sect, recited a verse full of resonant grandeur welcoming the king. When the verse * was explained – ‘ as if the exploit of the king was being explained ’ – the king became mightily pleased and invited the sūri again to his place (vs. 70–73 Pra. Cha.).

This meeting must have taken place between the last months of V. S. 1191 and the beginning of V. S. 1192–A. D. 1136.

The first literary fruit of the royal friendship was the great grammar of the Samskṛta language and the Prākṛta dialects known as Siddha - Hemachandra-Ṣabdānuṣāsana. In the last verse of the praṣasti at the end of this grammar, Hemachandra himself tells us how he came to write it: “ Muni Hemachandra composed this grammar–faultless and complete–being repeatedly requested by him (Ṣrī Siddharāja) who was tormented by grammars very lengthy, difficult to grasp, and incomplete ”. (v. 35). From the verses devoted to Siddharāja in the praṣasti, it becomes quite clear that the grammar was completed after the Mālava victory. It is highly probable that Jayasimha requested Hema-

* भूमिं कामगवि ! स्वगोमयरसैरासिञ्च रत्नाकरा !
मुक्तास्वस्तिकमातनुध्वमुडुप ! त्वं पूर्णकुम्भी भव ।
धृत्वा कल्पतरोर्दलानि सरलैर्दिग्वारणास्तोरणा–
न्याधत्त स्वकरैर्विजित्य जगतीं नन्वेति सिद्धाधिपः ॥

chandra to compose a good grammar after his return from Mālava. The Pra. Cha. gives a long account describing the occasion which was responsible for the writing of this grammar which is not only not contradictory to what Hemachandra himself says, but which supplements it, and which appears to be highly probable.

'Once when the officers were showing the king books from the Library of Avanti, his (Jayasimha's) eyes fell upon a 'lakshaṇa pustaka'–a book on grammar. The king, asked " What is this ? " Swāmi that is Hemachandra answered " This is the Bhoja - Vyākaraṇa. It is the prevelant grammar of the language. The lord of Mālava was the crest–jewel of the learned. He composed works on Ṣabdaṣāstra, Alamkāraṣāstra, Daivṇjaṣāstra and Tarkaṣāstra." Thus Hemachandra goes on mentioning the various works by Bhoja (vs. 74–78).' The patriotic jealousy of the king was probably roused. ' He asked: " Have we no such series of scientific books in our library ? Have we no learned man (Vidvān) in all Gurjara deṣa ? " The learned men (in the assembly) looked at Hemachandra, all simultaneously. The king very respectfully appealed to Hemachandra and requested him : " Fulfil my desire, Oh Maharshi ! Compose the science which will give proficiency in Language. Who, other than you, is the master ? At the present time, the short Kalāpaka grammar is in use; but it does not give sufficient knowledge of the language. There is the Grammar of Pāṇini. But the Brāhmaṇas say it is a part of the Veda (Vedasya angam); and through arrogance they are fault–finding. What is to be done when they are averse ? Oh leader of the Munis !

compose a new grammar for the benefit of all people. I will have celebrity and you will have celebrity and merit." '

Thus, the 'abhyarthanā' or the repeated request of the king, referred to by Hemachandra himself is described by the Pra. Cha. There are, of course, poetic flourishes in the description, but there is no reason to doubt the historicity of the occasion. We have seen, before, that the rivalry between Mālava and Gujarāt was not only political but literary and cultural also. The kings of Gujarat were as jealous of the paramountcy of their learned assembly as the paramountcy of their power. Jayasimha, in fact, wanted to emulate the famous Vikrama of Ujjayinī, and after he had become Avantinātha, it was but natural for Jayasimha to make his Gujarat superior in literary culture also

'Hemachandra replied: "Your word is only a reminder of what it is our duty to do. But there are eight grammars, and these works are, no doubt, in the library of Śrī Bhāratīdevī. Get them through your men from Kāṣmīradeśa; so that, Oh Great King! the science of language be composed well" ' (vs. 85–6–7).

This speech, if it embodies the substance of what Hemachandra might have said, indicates, why Hemachandra wanted to go to Kāsmīra. It was probably to be a great Vaiyākaraṇa; and to be a great Vaiyākaraṇa was the hall-mark of rare learning then, even as it is now, among the panditas of India. It secondly indicates that Hemachandra was thinking of writing a grammar even before the king requested him to do so. The grammar with its commentary and other appendices was quickly completed after the request

of the king. Looking to the great bulk of the matter and the time and the energy that would be required to prepare it, it would have been physically impossible if the work was not begun much earlier.

'Jayasimha immediately sent his officers to the Land of Vāgdevī-Learning. They went to Pravarapura – the same place from where Bilhaṇa had come, – and propitiated the goddess who ordered her officers to send men with the collection of books, as "Hemachandra was her own incarnation." The ministers of Bhāratī gave the books and sent a Pandita named Utsāha' (v. 88 – 92). *

'Hemachandra went through the collection of grammars and prepared a new and wonderful grammar which was named Siddha-Hemachandra Ṣabdānuṣāsana (v. 96). "The grammar was acclaimed as the best among grammars by all learned men and was accepted

* This Utsāha Paṇḍita must have been the same as is referred to in the Mudrita K. C. as one whose wonderful and great energy of learning was known in Śāradādeśa (p. 45)+ Thus there is no doubt about the historicity of this person. But it creates a chronological difficulty. If Utsāha pandita was present in V. S. 1181–A. D. 1125 in the court of Jayasimha, how could he be sent with the officers of Jayasimha in V. S. 1192–A. D. 1136 or after. We can explain the difficulty by supposing that Utsāha might have returned to Kāśmira after V. S. 1181 and that he must have been sent with the officers of Jayasimha to Gujarat, probobly because he was a familiar figure there Or we may have to assume that this grammar-writing incident might have happened much earlier, say, in V. S. 1180 and that it might have been finished only after Mālava victory in V. S. 1192 A. D. 1136. It may have something to do with Hemachandra's expedition of learning to Kāśmira.

as an authority by all the modern Panditas" (98–100). At the end of each pāda was attached a verse praising the kings of Chālukya dynasty from Mūlarāja onwards. The whole work was copied and sent to different parts of India. Twenty copies were sent to Kāṣmīra which were respectfully kept in her library by the Goddess of Learning' (v. 101-111).

'Kākala–a Kāyastha learned in eight grammars–was appointed the teacher of this grammar.* On the fifth of the bright half of every month known as Jn̄āna-panchamī, examinations were held and the successful candidates rewarded with armlets by the king (v. 112–115).

The enthusiasm of the reception that was accorded to his grammar must have inspired Hemachandra to write other works on allied subjects such as – lexicons, poetics, metrics, etc. We shall refer to these when we come to discuss Hemachandra's works.

Many are the incidents reported by the Pra. Cha., the P. C., and the K. Prabandh of Jinamaṇdana and other prabandhas about Hemachandra and Jayasimha. We cannot go into all these, but refer to one which throws light on the religious and ethical influence that Hemachandra exercised on Jayasimha.

Jayasimha, desirous of liberation, once, asked the leaders of various religious sects as to what was the truth in the matters of God, Religion and the Pātra (a proper perron)? Every sectarian praised his own creed and

* This Kākala is mentioned by Hemachandra himself, in his grammar as Kakkala. इति कक्कलस्य व्याख्या। अ. र. पृ. २०. See the Purātattva Vol. IV. p. 69.

slighted others. The king felt perplexed at this and consulted Hemachandra. He gave his answer in the form of a parable from the Purāṇas. The substance of it is as follows. ' A wife in her effort to win over her nusband from another woman got him transformed into a bull unwittingly. She repented, and once, standing under a tree and grazing her bull-husband began to bewail her lot. The God Ṣiva was passing through the heavens with his consort who heard the wailing of this unhappy woman and who asked her husband the cause and the remedy of it. Ṣiva said that in the shadow of the tree was growing a herb which could restore the human form. The woman heard this but did not know which was that particular herb; she drew a circle on the ground on which there was shadow and began to cut the grass and put it into the bull's mouth. When that particular herb, without her knowing it, was placed in the mouth of the bull he was restored to human shape. Hemachandra said, " Just as that particular herb, even though it was unidentified, did its work, similarly in this iron age even though the truth is hidden, one may get its benefit by respecting all darṣanas with proper devotion. That is a fact." ' (P. C. p. 70).

On other occasions Hemachandra is reported to have preached that ethical code which forms the common substance of all religions. *

Whether these stories are historical or not, they do indicate the spirit of Hemachandra's preachings to his royal friend. From the Anekānta point of view of Jainism, Hemachandra was doing just the thing that

* See the K. Prabandha of Jinamandana pp. 14 – 15.

was expected of him; for, Anekānta is claimed to be 'Sarvadarṣana-saṃgraha' by Hemachandra and other Jaina logicians. ×

Various motives explaining Hemachandra's attitude have been imagined by Dr. Bühler and other scholars which may or may not be real. Subjective element greatly affects such interpretations. Historically we can say this much–that even in those days in every sect, there were persons of higher type who took a broad and truly spiritual view of religious matters and who could understand the essential identity pervading through the warring creeds. We may quote as an instance the name of Jnānadeva,–the Ṣaiva pontiff of the time of Bhima I–who is reported to have said "Ṣiva is Jina. The emphasis on difference is the sign of a mithyāmati–a pseudo–philosopher." We may also remind the reader of the liberal minded Purohita Someṣvara who was instrumental in getting a footing for the suvihita monks * . So there is nothing improbable in imagining that Hemachandra really took a liberal view of things. His prayer to Ṣiva in Somanātha–pattana might also be regarded in this light as inspired by such a wider vision. He has also told us, in his Dvyāṣraya, how a Jaina sees in Ārhata, Ṣiva, Vishṇu and Brahmā (C. I. v. 79). This, however, did not make Hemachandra an inch less Jaina.

The practical effect of such a moral guidance must have been what it is reported to be by the contemporary

* We may mention another Someṣvara a great–grand son of this Someṣvara as a later example of this catholic type. He was a friend of the minister Vastupāla, and the author of the K. K. and the Surathotsava.

writer – Somaprabhāsūri, viz. 'in all doubtful questions he became worthy of consultation'×. We saw from the S. D. K. – which strictly maintains a Brahmanical and Ṣaivite atmosphere throughout the poem in contrast to the Jaina atmosphere of the P. D. K. – that Jayasimha built a Jaina temple of the last Tīrthamkara in Siddhapura after he had rebuilt Rudra Mahālaya, and that he put certain Brāhmaṇas to look after it – a fact confirmed by Somaprabha's K–Pratibodha also. In the last years of his life, Jayasimha must have felt some inclination towards Jainism as is evidenced by the Arab Geographer Al Idrasi who says that the king used to worship the Buddha image. This, however, does not mean that he wavered in his devotion to Ṣiva. In ancient India, kings were, by policy, tolerant of the different creeds of their subjects. In the case of Jayasimha. however, in his last years at least, we may imagine, it was not merely a matter of policy.

This inclination towards Jainism must have been largely the result of Jayasimha's contact with Hemachandra whose extraordinary learning and intelligence as well as strictly ascetic life of the Suvihita type as distinguished from the easygoing and luxurious life of the Chaityavāsi abbots, must have greatly impressed the mind of the king. There were, also, other Jaina monks in whose contact Jayasimha had been. We saw that Vīrāchārya was Jayasimha's friend from childhood. So also another Hemachandra – known as Maladhāri Hemachandra – had some influence with Jayasimha. This Hemachandra got the permission of Siddharāja to fly flags and put golden eggs on the Ṣikharas of

× See p. CCLXVII.

Jaina temples. He also got a copper-plate order from him prohibiting the killing of all animals for eighty days in a year. +

Now let us consider the relationship of Hemachandra with Kumārapāla. The first question that faces us is as to when did Kumārapāla and Hemachandra first meet. Dr. Buhler, on the strength of some verses in the Mahāvīracharita of Hemachandra, comes to the conclusion that 'Kumārapāla's acquaintence with Hemachandra began, according to the verse 53, in the time when the empire had achieved its greatest expansion and when the war-expeditions and conquests were over" (p. 34). The learned Doctor rejects the accounts of the Prabandhas on this topic as got up later on 'with a view to motivating the later relationship' (p. 34).

It appears to me, however, that the learned Doctor draws a conclusion from the verses based upon an implication which the verses do not carry. For the order of narration of events does not necessarily imply their chronological order, and when we study the verses carefully we find that no such sequence is intended. The first seven verses (45 – 51) describe Kumārapāla and his beneficent rule, the next verse (52) describes the extent of his empire and the last six verses (53–58) describe the 'daily' contact with Hemachandra. This is merely a way of narrating and does not imply, as Dr. Buhler believes, that Kumārapāla got acquainted with Hemachandra after the 'greatest expansion' of his empire. If it implies any such thing, it would be

+ See Note 53 in Dr. Buhler's Life of Hemachandra pp. 83-84 S. J. S.

only that their intimate contact 'doing honour daily to that monk' began after that 'greatest expansion' of his empire. It does not mean that their first acquaintence began at that time.

Another argument of Dr. Bühler that the prabandhas though mention early acquaintence do not describe the relationship of Hemachandra and Kumārapāla immediately after the latter became king. First, we cannot infer anything from the absence of mention, and secondly Kumārapāla in the beginning of his reign was too busy subduing his internal and external enemies and consolidating and extending his empire to think of religiously meeting Hemachandra. This, however, does not preclude the possibility of his early acquaintance and even occasional meeting after he got the throne. On the contrary, it appears to me that one of the causes of Kumārapāla's attachment to Hemachandra must have been the support he got, no doubt indirectly, from the monk through his rich and influential followers like Udayana and his son Vāgbhaṭa.

We have already referred to the meeting of Kumārapāla and Hemachandra when the former in his wanderings was looking for a shelter. We have also referred to the Horoscope of Kumārapāla which Hemachandra had cast. It is not necessary to assume the scientific validity of astrology in order to believe in the reality of this incident. For such things were quite common in those days as they are even now; and astrology with medicine was practised by Jaina monks in those days and was a means of getting influence over the people. So we may very well believe that the fulfilment of Hemachandra's forecast was one of the

events which made Kumārapāla believe in the infallibility of Hemachandra.

The Kumārapālaprabandha of Jinamaṇḍana mentions an earlier meeting of Kumārapāla and Hemachandra. 'Once Śrī Kumārapāla went to Pattana to wait upon Śrī Jayasimhadeva. There he saw Hemāchārya seated on a lion-seat before the king. He felt that this learned Jaina man is being respected by the king. It would be a meritorious thing to meet him' So Kumārapāla went to the lecture-hall of Hemāchārya and asked him which was the best virtue. Hemachandra answered: 'To look upon the wives of other people as one's own sisters is the king of virtues'; and gave a sermon on chastity (pp. 18 – 22).

If this meeting was at all historical, it must have been before Kumārapāla was compelled to wander about for fear of his life, that is about V. S. 1169–A. D. 1113. (See p CCI).

According to the Pra. Cha. when Kumārapāla could not succeed in subduing Arṇorāja, he offered worship at the suggestion of his minister Bāhaḍa to the image of Ajitanātha which was installed by the hands of Hemachandra (vs. 451 – 452). +

+ From the P. D. K., the Ku. Pratibodha and the Moharāja-parājaya - all contemporary works - we gather an impression that in the latter part of his reign, Kumārapāla's manner of life was like that of a good Śrāvaka following the twelve vows. Through his royal authority he had promulgated Amāri or non-killing of animals (D. K.). From the Moharāja-parājaya we learn that he tried to check drinking, gambling etc. He also built several Jaina temples.

According to Jinamaṇḍana's K-Prabandha it was in V. S. 1216-A. D. 1160 that Kumārapāla publicly took the Jaina vows. This date is not improbable.

Kumārapāla, however, as we saw, had no leisure up to V. S. 1207–A. D. 1151 to think about religious or ethical things. It was after his empire was consolidated that Kumārapāla came in real spiritual touch of Hemachandra. His minister Bāhaḍa must have been instrumental in fostering the relationship between Kumārapāla and Hemachandra. This is how we may interpret the passage from the Mahāviracharita about Kumārapāla.

Kumārapāla must have had great faith in Hemachandra. His forecast about his future kingship given at a time when he had not enough to eat, had come true. Hemachandra was then famous as a learned man and much respected by his predecessor Jayasimha. His great ministers like Bāhaḍa and others were Hemachandra's followers. Thus Kumārapāla was prepossessed in favour of Hemachandra. As the contact continued from day to day, Kumārapāla must have come more and more under the spiritual influence of Hemachandra. After some time Kumārapāla must have looked upon him as his guru.

Just as Hemachandra composed the Siddha-Hema grammar at the request of Jayasimha, so according to his own testimony, he composed the Yogaṣāstra, the Vītarāga-stutis and the Triṣhashṭiṣalākā-purusha-charita at the request of Kumārapāla.

From the fact that Hemachandra calls Kumārapāla a Paramārhata in the praṣasti of the Trishashṭiṣalakā-purusha-charita as also in the Abhidhānachintāmaṇi, we can infer that in Hemachandra's eyes Kumārapāla by that time must be following the ethical code of Jainism to such an extent as to deserve that title.

Here we might consider the question of Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism. In what sense, we may ask. Kumārapāla was converted to Jainism? There is sufficient proof for one answer, viz:-he was trying to follow the Jaina ethical mode of life. That he regarded Hemachandra as his spiritual guru and offered worship at the Jaina temples might also be taken as real. But if by conversion is meant that Kumārapāla abjured the faith of his fore-fathers and gave up the worship of Ṣiva and other Puranic deities, it is contradicted by other historical facts. First of all, we find, in the last canto of the S. D. K., Kumārapāla distinctly mentioning his devotion to Ṣiva; and secondly in the inscription of Bhāva-Bṛhaspati of the year V. S. 1229-A. D. 1173, the last year of Kumārapāla's reign, he is called 'Māheṣvara-nṛpāgraṇī, the foremost of Māheṣvara kings' (v. 47). From these facts, it becomes clear that though Kumārapāla's mode of life was changed, that though the old way of worshipping with animal-sacrifice was also completely given up, he did not cease to be a worshipper of Ṣiva – the god of his fore-fathers.

This might appear anomalous to people accustomed to strict sectarianism; but in those days of religious elasticity it was not uncommon.

We saw what advice Hemachandra gave to Siddharāja-Jayasimha. When Hemachandra, according to the P. C., went to Somanātha-Pattana with Kumārapāla, he was asked by the king to utter prayers to Ṣiva; and Hemachandra did it in verses which are preserved. So also in a more authentic form, we find prayers to Ṣiva in the S. D. K.. As Buddhisāgara pointed out to Someṣvara, it was only the emphasis

on dayā – compassion especially towards animals, that mainly mattered; and we find Kumārapāla promulgating Amāri and annuling the law of confiscating the mṛta-vitta (– the wealth of a man who died without heir).

The effect of Kumārapāla's efforts to reform ethically the life of the people did not become permanent; but in some respects they must have deeply affected the consciousness of the people in Gujarat. This can be inferred from the fact that even to this day in Gujarat there is a natural aversion to killing animals, eating flesh and drinking liquors at least in higher society and that in all grades of Hindus it is regarded as a religious and meritorious act to give up these things.

We saw, while discussing Kumārapāla's reign that if the account of the Prabandhakoṣa was to be believed, Hemachandra was consulted by Kumārapāla even in important political matters such as succession to the throne. In other matters, especially those pertaining to public reforms according to his preachings, his advice also must have been sought. In the colophon of the Ṭ. Ṣ. Ṣalakā-purusha-charita which was one of his later works, Hemachandra informs his readers as follows on this point:

" The Chālukya King Kumārapāla-the conqueror of Chedi, Daṣārṇa, Mālava, Kuru, Sindhu and other inaccessible countries through the power of his own arms,-a veritable lion,-a descendent of Ṣrī Mūlarāja, -properly disciplined, and a great Ārhata (devotee of Arhat), once bowed to him (Āchārya Hemachandra) and spoke " Oh Lord ! receiving orders from you who render service without any expectation, I stopped throughout the earth all things that lead to hell-such

sinful things as gambling and drinking liquors, gave up taking the wealth of a person who died without a son and decorated the earth with the temples of Arhat and thus became Samprati of the present age." (vs. 16 - 18).

Hemachandra's relationship with other influential persons like the great Udayana and his equally great son Bāhaḍa as also with Ābhaḍa and others was also very intimate. His attitude towards the learned men of other sects was, generally, liberal. He. as we saw, greatly appreciated the learning of Devabodha of the Bhāgavata sect and was instrumentsal in bringing about friendship between him and Śrīpāla. His relationship with Āmiga, however, must not have been cordial. In those days of debates and controversies, he must have given and received many blows in the battles of wits. But the discipline of tapas that he received early in life must have made this man of intellect sufficiently patient to bear them calmly, and not allow them to come in the way of his spiritual development. We shall come to this aspect of his character when we discuss his works especially the Yogaśāstra

Hemachandra, according to the Prac. Cha., died in the year V. S. 1229-A D. 1173 at the ripe old age of 84 years - a short time before Kumārapāla died.*

---

* Hemachandra had a group of disciples who were very learned and who helped him in his works. Of these, Rāmachandra deserves special mention. He is reputed to be the author of a hundred prabandhas that is compositions. Some of his plays are published; they are good as literature and show considerable skill in the technique of play-writing. His Nāṭyadarpaṇa-a work on

19

Now we come to the literary work of Hemachandra. Tradition credits him with the authorship of innumerable compositions, to the extent of three and a half crore verses. Some of these works are, however, of doubtful authorship; yet the works, which are undoubtedly Hemachandra's, are so extensive in volume and varied in subject-matter, as to make one agree with those who have conferred upon him the title of 'Kalikālasarvajna – The Omniscient of the Iron Age.'

Hemachandra himself provides us with definite information about his main works.

In the colophon of the T. S. P. C. already referred to, Kumārapāla, after mentioning what he did at the order of Hemachandra, says "Formerly at the request of the devoted king Siddharāja–my predecessor, you first composed a grammar with appendices, and made easy by a good commentary. Then for me you composed the fault-less Yogaṣāstra and for people (Lokāya) Dvyāṣraya, and other Ṣāstras – the principal among them being Chhandas, Alamkṛti and Nāma-Samgraha. You are always ready to do good to people; yet I make this much request that for the knowledge of people like myself bring to light the lives of sixty-three great men.

"On account of his pressure Hemachandrāchārya composed in fine language the lives of great men with the sole view of imparting Dharma" (v. 18–20).

Dramaturgy–has been published in the G. O. S. It throws some new light on the history of Sanskrta Drama. His Kumāra-vihāra Ṣataka is a fine piece of description and gives an idea of what big temples were in those days. The poem should be studied carefully by every student of Gujarat architecture and art.

These verses mention Hemachandra's main works in his own words. They are—

(1) The Grammar with appendices and commentary, that is the Ṣabdānuṣāsana.

(2) The Yogaṣāstra.

(3) The Dvyāṣraya.

(4) The Chhandonuṣāsana.

(5) The Kāvyānuṣāsana.

(6) The Nāmasamgraha, that is, the Abhidhāna - chintāmaṇi, Desi Nāmamālā and other dictionaries, and (7) The Trishashtiṣalākā - purusha - charita.

The order of mention, however, is not the chronological order.

To these, on the authority of their respective colophons and that of Somaprabha and that of Yaṣahpāla (the author of the Moharājaparājaya), we add the Vītarāgastutis and the two Dvātrimṣikās and the Pramāṇāmīmāmsā.

Ṣabdānuṣāsana is Hemachandra's first major work. We do not know if he had written anything before this. It is likely, however, that he must have had some practice in writing.

We have, already, described the occasion of composing this grammar, how the work was done and what success it met with. According to the P. C., the whole grammar was written in a year. This, however, appears to be physically impossible. Any how the work, must have been finished before the death of Siddharāja in V. S. 1199-A. D. 1143.

A grammar consists of five parts: (1) Sūtra (2) Gaṇapāṭha. (3) Dhātupāṭha (4) Uṇadi and (5) Lingānuṣāsana.

In the case of other grammars, all these five parts are composed by different persons. In the case of Siddha - Hema, all the five parts are the work of Hemachandra. This is one of the unique features of this grammar which makes it a complete and consistent whole. Another unique feature of this Ṣabdānuṣāsana is that it is a grammar of Samskṛta as well as of Prākṛta dialects.

The S. H. consists of eight Adhyāyas, each adhyāya consisting of four pādas. The total volume of the sūtras is 1100 ṣlokas (each ṣloka having eight syllables). The total number of the sūtras is 4685 of which 3566 describe the Samskṛta language while 1119 the Prākṛta dialects. On these Sūtras, Hemachandra has written two commentaries the Laghuvṛtti and the Bṛhadvṛtti - the Small Commentary and the Great Commentary. Supplementing these are the Dhātupārāyaṇa with his own commentary, Uṇādi with his own commentary and the Lingānuṣāsana with a Bṛhat - Tīkā *.

* I cannot go into a detailed description of the work here. I refer the reader to the learned article of the Vyākarana Tīrtha Pandita Bechardas with the title 'Gujaratanu Pradhāna Vyākaraṇa' 'The Principal Grammar of Gujarat' published in the Puratattva, Vol. IV, pp. 61-100. Pandit Bechardas who is a great Vaiyākaraṇa (master of grammar) himself has given a detailed description of the S. H., compared it with other Samskṛta grammars by pointing its indebtedness to them as well as its special features, showed its superiority as a text book, and given us an idea as to what a mine of grammatical lore is its Bṛhadvṛtti. In an appendix to his article the learned Paṇdita has given a historical account of other grammars of Gujarat and also of later commentators.

Dr. Belvalkar's 'Systems of Sanskrta Grammar' contains a chapter on the Hemachandra School (pp. 73-81).

Hemachandra also wrote a Bṛhannyāsa on his grammar–a fragment of which has been discovered and edited by Pt. Bhagavandas Doshi. According to the tradition the extent of this work was 84000 ṣlokas. If we are to judge from the fragment, we can say that the tradition is right. This work is modelled upon the Mahābhāshya of Patanjali.

Hemachandra, has, consciously, tried to give his work a non-sectarian character by making his Mangala in such a way as to be acceptable to all the sects. In the commentary on the second sūtra, Hemachandra makes it clear that " As Ṣabdānuṣāsana is common to all sects, it would be very pleasant to have recourse to Syādvāda which is the synthesis of all Darṣanas."

This grammar is not only a work of profound and wide learning, but is written with such skill as to make the whole subject clear to students of different grades. The author has not pretended to be original in a subject where there was not much scope for originality of matter, but has aimed at being as useful to the students of the subject as he could. Judged from this point of view there is a distinct originality in the treatment of the matter. And we must remember, the royal request was to prepare a grammar which would be 'perfect' and yet 'easy to grasp'. That purpose is completely fulfilled in this work. In fact, in estimating the works of Hemachandra, we must always keep in mind the aim which he generally makes clear in the beginning of his books.

After the grammar with its Angas was completed Hemachandra undertook lexicography of Samskṛta and Deṣi words. We learn this from the first verses of

the works themselves. Here also Hemachandra wrote the texts as well as commentaries. He says:—

"I, who have finished the Sabdānusāsana with its angas, bowing to the Arhatas (the worshippable ones and the Jinas) compose Nāma-mālā-the Garland of Nouns, some of which are not capable of derivation according to grammatical rules, some are, and others in certain senses are derivable and in certain not." In the commetary, Hemachandra gives this Garland of Nouns the name of Abhidhānachintāmaṇi.

In the first verses of the commentary Hemachandra says "Bowing to the speech of those who are the authors of Dharmatīrtha, I compose an exposition (Vivṛti) on my Nāmamālā which will make clear the essence. (This might also mean that the name of the commentary is Tattvabodhavidhāyinī (1). This effort is for the purpose of Ṣreyas. What is the good of boasting? The thoughtful will never indulge in praising one's self and slandering others (2). In this work, be it noted, Prāmāṇya - (that is - authenticity of words etc.) is from Vāsuki and Vyāḍi, Vyutpatti (derivation) from Dhanapāla, and Prapancha (comprehensiveness) from Vāchaspati and others (3)." Hemachandra thus mentions his principal authorities in the third verse. Whether a particular word is genuine or not he has decided on the authority of Vāsuki and Vyādi; as to how a particular word is to be explained, he has consulted Dhanapāla to whom we have already referred. To make his work comprehensive he has drawn upon Vāchaspati and others.

The second verse is significant. It suggests that Hemachandra's grammar might have been

severely criticised and in his opinion unjustly criticised by some contemporary critics. That is probably why he is so particular in referring to his authorities in the very beginning of this work. We shall touch this point again when we come to discuss his Pramāṇamīmāṃsā.

Appendices known as A. C. Parisishta-were also composed and placed at the end of each Kāṇḍa of the A. C. This work is, however, not a separate entity and we have no means to decide whether it is Hemachandra's own work or some of his students.

Hemachandra completed his Samskṛta lexicon by writing a supplement known as Anekārtha-samgraha. In the first verse, Hemachandra says " I, who have made a collection of words having one meaning, now, contemplating the Arhats, prepare Anekārtha-samgraha (collection of words having more than one meaning) by arranging words, according to their number of syllables, in six chapters "

The commentary on the Anekārtha Samgraha is composed by Hemachandra's disciple Mahendrasūri in the name of Hemachandra, as M. himself says, at the end of the second Kāṇḍa (p. 86 Edition of the A. S. by Th. Tachariac).

Thus Hemachandra established his reputation as a Samskṛta Lexicographer. That this work became current and that Hemachadra was regarded as an authority is proved by many quotations from his work in later commentaries as well as from the verse: हेमचन्द्रश्च रुद्रश्चामरोऽयं सनातनः ।

Abhidhānachintāmaṇi with its supplements and commentaries is, like the S. H., characterized by the

clearness of its exposition and the comprehensiveness of its subject-matter. One might say that the commentary Tattvabodhavidhāyinī which was composed in the reign of Kumārapāla is a veritable mine of information on Samskṛta lexicography. If it is studied carefully and critically, it will throw a flood of light on the history of the subject.

Just as Hemachandra, by composing an adhyāya on the Prākṛta dialects, made his grammar unique and comprehensive of all languages current in India, to make his lexicographical work perfect, he composed a dictionary of Deṣya words.

The last verse of the work says "This collection of Deṣi words named Rayaṇāvali (a necklace of jewels) is composed by Sirī Hemachandra as a seshalaesha (a small appendix) to grammar' (v. 77). In the commentary it is called an appendix to the eighth Adhyāya. Thus according to the author himself, it is to be regarded as connected with his grammar. We gather the same impression from the introduction to the commentary also.

So strictly speaking, we should say that this work belongs to the department of grammar rather than that of lexicography. The word Ṣabdānuṣāsana, however, is comprehensive enough to include grammar and lexicography. Hemachandra himself uses this word in this comprehensive sense in his Kāvyānuṣāsana.

This work on Deṣi words which resisted all attempts at systematization was of peculiar difficulty; and its accomplishment was a matter of satisfaction to the Āchārya. He, himself, says "Deṣi is difficult to collect, and even if collected, it is generally difficult to grasp Therefore, Āchārya Hemachandra collects it and classifies it."

By using the word 'Deṣī' in the feminine gender, Hemachandra wishes us to understand it as a part of the language which could not be treated satisfactorily according to the rules of Samskṛta and Prākṛta languages which he had formulated in his grammar. Hemachandra, nowhere, suggests that the Deṣī cannot be derived from the Samskṛta. Dr. Bühler indulged in much gratuitous criticism as he did not clearly grasp this conception of the author himself.

Prof. Muralydhar Banerjee in his introduction to the Desīnāmamāla has ably discussed the whole question of Deṣī and answered the points raised against Hemachandra (Sections I & II).

As to the illustrative verses, Prof. Pischell remarked " These examples are either void of all sense or of an incredible stupidity ...... It was a most disgusting task to make out the sense of these examples some of which have remained rather obscure to me " (p. 8) Introduction Deṣināmamāla. B. S. S.).

Prof. Banerjee, however, remarks "If the illustrative gāthās of Hemachandra which have appeared to Pischel as examples of ' extreme absurdity ' or nonsense are read correcting the errors made by the copyists in the manner explained above they will yield very good sense. A few examples of such corrected readings are given below to make the point clear" (pp. XLIII to LI). Afrer discussing this point in detail, Prof. Banerjee comes to the conclusion: " As the gāthās when read in this way give a good sense, they can no longer be regarded as examples of ' incredible stupidity. ' They will be appreciated, it is hoped, by every lover of poetry as a remarkable feat of

ingenuity worthy of Hemachandra and far beyond the capacity of his disciples to whom Pischel is inclined to ascribe them" (p. L I).

This is an example of how further research can sometimes reverse the previous judgements.

The importance of Rayaṇāvali or Deśināmamālā cannot be exaggerated for the philology of modern provincial languages of India. It deserves to be utilized more by our philologists than it has been up till now.

In this work, as in his previous ones, Hemachandra has made good use of the works of his predecessors. He quotes about twelve authors and two kośas. * Avantisundarī is one of the authorities referred to. She must be the wife of the poet Rājaśekhara who refers to her as an authority in his Kāvyamīmāmsā and who, therefore, must have been very learned and written some works on the subject.

After the work of Rayaṇāvalī was over, Hemachandra prepared a botanical dictionary known as Nighaṇṭuśesha. He himself says in the first verse " I, who have made collections of words having one meaning, those having more than one meaning and Deśya words, shall, after bowing to the foot-lotus of Arhat, speak of Nighantuśesha (1).

No commentary on this work is known.

This completed Hemachandra's work on lexicography. The grammar comprizing the five angas with their commentaries, and the four lexicons–the Abhidhānachintāmaṇi with its commentary, the Anekārtha-samgraha, the Rayaṇāvali (of Deśya words) with its commentary, and the Nighaṇṭuśesha–completed his Śabdānuśāsana that is Science of Words.

* Banerjee's Introduction to Desināmamālā p. XXXIX.

Thus in different departments of the study of language as then known, Hemachandra provided students of Gujarat with excellent text books containing the substance of each discipline-presented in a lucid precise and rational form; for advanced students Hemachandra wrote his copious commentaries giving them all the available information on the subject up to date. For purposes of study Hemachandra's works are unsurpassed.

Thus was fulfilled the royal wish of Jayasimha Siddharāja in a manner and a style befitting that monarch, who, above all, loved grandeur and aimed at supremacy in everything. One may say, Jayasimha not only built a University in mortar and stone but provided it with excellent books for study *.

It is likely that this part of Hemachandra's literary activity was finished by V. S. 1199–A. D. 1143 the end of Siddharāja's reign and the beginning of Kumrāapāla's reign. Seven years (V. S 1192–1199) were scarcely too many for such a stupendous task. It was only possible for a man like Hemachandra whose powers of concentration and retention were developed by Yogic exercises. And it is a question whether even he could have accomplished it unaided and without ample facility of books. As it was, Hemachandra was provided with a good library by his royal friend. Hemachandra, also had the assistance of his

* As a modern poet of Gujarat with a fine pun on the word Haima has said "Siddharāja by lighting the Haima-pradipa-(the Golden Lamp and the light-giver Hema) of Sarasvatī made his name meaningful."

हैमप्रदीप प्रगटावी सरस्वतीनो सार्थक्य कीधु निज नामनु सिद्धराजे.

From the poem Rāṇakadevī, by Prof. Ramanarayan Pathak.

pupils like Mahendrasūri, Rāmachandra, Guṇachandra and others who were only next to him in learning.

The Pra. Cha. supplies us with a brief but realistic description of the audiance-hall of Hemachandra which was something like an Academy of Letters. The occasion is the coming of Devabodha – the Bhāgavata to see Hemachandra.

"He (Devabodha) went to the audience-hall (Āsthāna) of Śri Hemachandrasūri. There the great poets were busy composing new works; great number of words were being written upon a number of paṭṭikā-paṭṭas (writing boards); discussions with one another were going on about the derivation of words and illustrations were being quoted from old poets. It was the residence of Brahmollāsa, the parental abode of Bhāratī, a place where the learned were well provided. +

The Samskṛta Dvyāśraya Kāvya must have been begun after the completion of the Siddha-Hema. But this epic of twenty cantos must have been composed at intervals. How many cantos were written before the death of Jayasimha we cannot exactly say. The last five cantos which are devoted to Kumārapāla, were, no doubt, written in the middle of Kumārapāla's reign; but it is a question whether all the first fifteen

* अन्यदाभिनवग्रन्थगुम्फाकुलमहाकवौ ।
पट्टिकापट्टसंघातलिख्यमानपदव्रजे ॥
शब्दव्युत्पत्तयेऽन्योन्यं कृतोहापोहबन्धुरे ।
पुराणकवि–संदृष्ट–दृष्टान्तीकृतशब्दके ॥
ब्रह्मोल्लासनिवासेऽत्र भारतीपितृमन्दिरे ।
श्रीहेमचन्द्रसूरीणामास्थाने सुस्थकोविदे ॥

Pra. Cha. p. 314, vs. 292-294.

cantos were finished before V.S. 1199-A.D. 1143; though Jayasimha might have insisted upon its completion. I think the first fourteen cantos narrating the events up to the conquest of Mālava must have been composed early enough to be placed before Jayasimha. The fifteenth canto which refers to the succession of Kumārapāla, was, probably, written in the early part of Kumārapāla's reign.

The remaining five cantos and the Prākṛta Dvyāṣraya must have been written in the latter part of Kumārapāla's reign. *

The substance of these historical epics, we have utilized in describing the history of the Chalukya family of Aṇahillapura. Another name of the S. D. K. is Chālukyavamśotkīrtana as that of the P. D. K. is Kumārapālacharita.

Of the poetic merits of these epics, if any, I shall speak later on.

After the Śabdānuśāsana, comes the Kāvyānuśāsana. In the second sūtra, Hemachandra says "The correct speech was discussed by us in Śabdānuśāsana, now its poetic aspect is being laid down by us in its correct form." In the commentary, Śabdānuśāsana is described as the Siddha-Hemachandrābhidhāna-grammar bearing the name Siddha - Hemachandra. The identity of the authorship is also mentioned.

* Another alternative suggestion that both the D. Ks were written, after the Anuśāsanas were finished in the reign of Kumārapapāla is also tenable. The fact that they are not mentioned in Anuśāsanas can also be interpreted in both ways, viz:—that either the poem being written piecemeal was incomplete at the time of the composition of the Anuśāsanas or that they were not begun at all.

The Viveka was evidently composed after the Chhandonuṣāsana, as it refers to it. The general description of the work, we have already given in the pages I-X of this introduction. Its subject-matter will be critically discussed in a separate section.

The Chhandonuṣāsana was composed after the Kāvyānuṣāsana, as we learn from its first verse; but before the Viveka on the Kāvyānuṣāsana, as we just now saw. Hemachandra says in the first verse " I, who have completed Sabdā - Kāvya - Anuṣāsanas, after contemplating the speech of Arhat, will speak of the Anuṣāsana of the Chhandas (metres) useful to poetry ". In the commentary, the identity of the authorship of the Ṣabdānuṣāsana, the Kāvyānuṣāsana and the Chhandonuṣāsanā is reiterated.

This work consists of about 763 sūtras divided into eight Adhyāyas.* As usual, the commentary is lucid and interesting. The information that it gives on the Prākṛata and especially the Apabhraṃṣa metres is invaluable, and is likely to throw much light on the

* The first Adhyāya which consists of 16 sūtras is called the Saṇjādhyāya, because it explains the technical words and signs used in the work. The second Adhyāya consists of 415 sūtras and is called the Samavṛttavyāvarṇanā (because it describes metres of uniform lines). The third Adhyāya consists of 73 sūtras and describes arddhasama vṛttas, vishama vṛttas and mātrā chhandas. The fourth Adhyāya consists of 91 sūtras and describes Āryā, Galitaka, Khanjaka, and Ṣīrshaka metres. The fifth Adhyāya consists of 49 sūtras and discusses Utsāha and other metres. The sixth Adhyāya consists of 29 sūtras and describes Shatpadī, Chatushpadī etc. The seventh consists of 73 sūtras and describes Dvipadī; the eighth consists of 17 sūtras and describes scansion.

history of metres used in the different provincial languages of India. The illustrative stanzas also deserve attention; especially the Prākṛta and Apabhraṃśa ones. The poetic quality of many of these verses is really high and if the majority of them are the work of Hemachandra, as it is supposed to be, they would show him to be a lyric poet of a high order.

The work requires to be critically edited and annotated.

Thus these three Anuśāsanas, the Śabdānuśāsana, the Kāvyānuśāsana and the Chhandonuśāsana - and if the Lingānuśāsana is to be taken separately, four Anuśāsanas, and the two D. K. s comprise among themselves, the whole field of Lakshaṇa and Sāhitya vidyās. They are Hemachandra's authentic contributions to the science and the art of language as they were understood in Ancient India.

Thus after making his contributions to the study of Lakshaṇa and Sāhitya, Hemachandra turned his attention to Pramāṇaśāstra or Tarka-Logic and Dialectics. On this subject, he wrote a work called Pramāṇa-mīmāmsa. In the commentary on the first verse, Hemachandra says "that after the Śabdānuśāsana, the Kāvyānuśāsana and the Chhandonuśāsana, Pramāna is being considered now. The identity of the authorship of the Śabdānuśāsana etc. with that of this work is also implied."

From the introduction to the first sūtra, we learn that this work Pramāṇa-mīmāmsā * was to consist of five Adhyāyas, no doubt on the model of the five adhyāyas of Gotam's Nyāya sūtra. But only a fragment

* A critical edition of this work is being prepared by Pt. Sukhlalji to be published in the S. J. S.

of this work has been recovered which extends up to the end of the first Āhnika of the second adhyāya. Either the Āchārya did not live to finish the work, or the remaining portion yet awaits discovery if it is not destroyed. As it is, we have a hundred sūtras and the commentary on them preserved for us.

This work or the fragment of the work is interesting from many points of view. It shows Hemachandra as a logician and a master of the Darṣanas. The work is characterized by his usual lucidity and preciseness of exposition.

The introduction to the first sūtra throws interesting light on the conception of authorship which Hemachandra had. ‘ The pūrva–paksha asks why does the author pose as a Jaina sūtrakāra ? There were so many sūtrakars before ! Hemachandra answers : “Your question is narrow. Rather ask what and how many were the grammatical and other sūtras before Pāṇini, Pingala, Kaṇāda, Akshapāda and others ? ” The opponents' silence is to be understood as allowing that there were many. Then Hemachandra goes on saying “ These disciplines (Vidyās) are without a beginning (Anādi); they become new from the point of view of Samkshepa-summarizing and Vistāra-expanding, and are said to be composed by this and that author also from the same point of view ” * What Hemachandra

---

* ननु यदि भवदीयानीमानि जैनसिद्धान्तसूत्राणि तर्हि भवतः पूर्वं कानि किमीयानि वा तान्यासन्निति । अत्यल्पमिदमन्वयुङ्क्थाः । पाणिनिपिङ्गलकणादाक्षपादादिभ्योऽपि पूर्वं कानि किमीयानि वा व्याकरणादिसूत्राणीत्येतदपि पर्यनुयुङ्क्ष्व । अनादय एवैता विद्याः संक्षेपविस्तारविवक्षया नवनवीभवन्ति, तत्तत्कर्तृकाश्चोच्यन्ते । प्र. मी. pp. 1–2

means is probably this: no author writes anything absolutely new, it is only the development and the treatment that is new. +

We saw, in the review of his literary activity which Hemachandra has given in the praśasti of the T. S. P. C., that the grammar was written at the request of Jayasimha, while the Dvyāśrayas, the Kāvyānuṣāsana, the Chhandonuṣāsana, and the lexicons and other Ṣāstras (which might include the Pramāṇa-mīmamsā if it was then written) were written for the people. From this reference it is clear that Hemachandra's intention, in this part of his activity. was to serve not merely Jainas but all the people, for the word - lokāya - does not mean " for Jainas " only, but "for people in general." I think the significance of this emphasis of Hemachandra has not been properly grasped by scholars * who say that Hemachandra's intention in composing these works was to provide merely for his correligionists. The public which Hemachandra had, in his view, was, no doubt, wider than his own sect.

Now, we come to discuss the works which Hemachandra wrote at the request of Kumārapāla. Even these works which are sectarian in subject-matter have a wider appeal on account of their easy style and manner of treatment.

+ These remarks of Hemachandra in the P. M. suggest that Hemachandra was probably criticised for claiming to be an author of various works in which he mostly systematized what others had said.

* For example Prof. Jacobi. See his Introduction to the PariSishtaparvan p. XXIII B. I. S.

Of these, the main are the Yogaṣāstra, the T. S. P. C. including the Pariṣishta-parvan and the Vītarāga-stutis including the two well-known Dvātrimṣikās.

The subject-matter of the Yogaṣāstra is distinctly religious. The whole work consists of twelve Prakāṣas. Yoga is described as the thing that leads to liberation (lit. cause of liberation) and it consists of three jewels - Jnāna (knowledge), Ṣraddhā (faith), and Chāritra (conduct) (v. 15). In this part, Yoga is described in Jaina terminology. The first three Prakāṣas are devoted to ethical rules in Jaina phraseology. In the fourth Prakāṣa soul is identified with the " three jewels " and then follows description of Yoga which embodies the substance of the Yoga-system of Patanjali. The fourth discusses the nature of contemplation, āsanas, etc. The fifth describes the control of breath and the acquisition of miraculous powers. The rest of the prakāṣas are devoted to similar topics.

In the fourth verse of the first prakāṣa, Hemachandra says " After having acquired knowledge from the ocean of learning, the tradition of sadgūru (the initiator), and one's own experience, the Yoga-ṣāstra is being composed. " The same thing is repeated in the fifty-fifth and the last verse of the twelfth prakāṣa, with the additional information that " Āchārya Hemachandra put into language the secret of Yoga at the repeated request of Ṣrī Chālukya Kumārapāla-the king." +

The commentary on the first four prakāṣas is prolix -in the style of Jaina Vyākhyānas or sermons narrating anecdotes, stories, etc.; while on the remaining prakāṣas, it is brief. Probably the commentary is not the work

+Prakāṣa 3, v. 4; Prakāṣa 12, v. 55.

of Hemachandra himself but of one of his pupils. It contains passages from the T. S. P. C. also.

The Trişashṭi-śalākāpurusha-charita + is a huge work composed in ten parvans, and the Parişishṭa parvan is a sort of appendix to it.

The work is written in an easy flowing style and contains fine descriptions. It has for its model the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. One cannot judge such a huge work by examining minor details, but it should be judged in its total effect.

Prof. Jacobi has carefully examined the Anushṭubh metre as it is used by Hemachandra in this work, and come to the conclusion that Hemachandra 'had used the ṣloka in a way peculiar to himself' (pp. XXI). But I think the learned professor is a little beside the mark when he says "He (Hemachandra) apparently attempted to facilitate the literary activities of the Jainas by making the Ṣloka a more handy means of composition than its classical model..." (pp. XXIII). I am inclined to regard the liberty which Hemachandra has taken with the Anushṭubh metre as due to the fact that he was writing this work on the model of the Purāṇas, the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata which have metres which are lose in comparison with those of the later Kāvyas.

The Vītarāga stotra consists of about 186 verses. It is divided into twenty Stavas-(prayers)-most of them having eight verses. *

+ The sixtythree great men include twentyfour Tīrthamkaras, the twelve Chakravartins, the nine Vāsudevas, the nine Baladevas, and the nine Prativāsudevas.

* (1) The Prastāvanā stava (2) The Sahajātişaya-varṇanāstava (3) Karmakshayajātişayavarṇanā stava

In the last stanza of the Vītarāgastava, Hemachandra says "Let Kumārapāla get the desired fruit from this stava (prayer) of Vītarāga originating from Śrī Hemachandra."

These are known also as the "Twenty Vītarāgastutis" which are referred to in the Moharājaparājaya as "Twenty Divyagulikās that is divine pills." These hymns include also the two well-known Dvātrimṣikās or set of thirty two stanzas, the Ayogavyavacchedikā and the Anyayogavyavachchhedikā i. e. 'that in which the author disproves the allegation that Jainism is wrong, and that in which the claims of other systems that they are right' (p. XVIII Introduction Syādvādamanjari" B. S. S.).

These poems are the philosophical hymns of Hemachandra. The poetic diction in them is of a high order and they sometimes rise, in spite of their philosophical preoccupation, to a real poetic grandeur. The following remarks of Principal Anandsankar Dhruv quoted from his learned introduction to the Syādvādamanjarī on the Anyayogavyavacchedikā, more or less apply to all these stutis: "The former (the A. V.) is a genuine devotional lyric, pulsating with reverence for the master and is at the same time a review of

(4) Sukṛtātiṣayavarṇanāprakāṣa (5) Pratihāryastava (6) Vipakshanirāsaprakāṣa (7) Jagat Kartṛtvanirāsaprakāṣa (8) Ekāntanirāsastava (9) Kalipraṣamrastava (19) Adbhutastava (11) Achintyamahimastava (12) Vairāgyaṣtava (13) Virodhastava (14) Yogasiddhastava (15) Bhaktistava (16) Ātmagarhāstava (17) Sarvastava (18) Kaṭhorāstava (19) Ājnāstava (20) Āṣīhstava.

some of the tenets of the rival schools on which the Jaina sees reason to differ. Devotion and thought are happily blended together in one whole, and are expressed in such noble and dignified language that it deserves to rank as a piece of literature no less than that of philosophy (P. C. XXIV). "

This brief review of Hemachandra's literary work will, I hope, give some idea of the contribution he made to Samskṛta Learning and Literature. It is a very difficult task to give a proper estimate of his work. Only a scholar of Hemachandra's capacity can do it justice. It surely makes one feel that the man who did all this work must have possessed extraordinary intellectual powers – must have been a veritable intellectual giant.

We can divide Hemachandra's work into two parts : Ṣāstric and literary or poetic. We saw that his Ṣāstric activity covered almost the whole field of the then known branches of learning. These works, as we saw, are characterized by clearness of exposition and lucidity and preciseness of expression. They seem to be designed with the practical view of providing excellent and exhaustive books for the purposes of study. They are, however, not remarkable for originality of ideas. *

The following remarks of Prof. Jacobi give a fair estimate of Hemachandra's work : " Hemachandra has very extensive and at the same time accurate knowledge of many branches of Hindu and Jaina learning combined with great literary skill, and an

* Hemachandra has given, his idea of originality (lit novelty) and authorship in the Pramāṇamīmamsā. pp. CCCIV–CCCV.

easy style. His strength lies in encyclopaedical work rather than in original research but the enormous mass of varied information which he gathered from original sources, mostly lost to us, makes his works an inestimable mine for philological and historical research." (Ency. of Religion and Ethics Vol VI. p.591).

Hemachandra's sastric work has, always, been so much in the fore-front that it has, so to say, monopolized the attention of the students of his work – now and in ancient times; yeṭ a careful study of his poetic works reveals him to be a poet of no mean order. His two Dvyāṣrayas, his illustrative verses in the Rayaṇāvali (or the Deṣināmamāla) and the Chhandonuṣāsana, the T. S. P. C. and the devotional hymns, throw a flood of lıght on his poetic faculty.

Possibly sôme critics will feel it strange that I should think of associating poetry with the Dvyāṣrayas– which are, in their opinion, merely grammatical exercises. But is it not a peculiarity of poetry that it is sometimes discovered in strange places? Let it be, at once, granted that the language of the S. D. K. is uncouth; it is there on purpose. But once you get accustomed to it and pierce through its forbidding exterior you get genuine epic poetry. The descriptions of the S. D. K. are generally picturesque and realistic, e. g. the description of Aṇahillapura, that of the sudden appearance of monsoon when Karṇa was practising penance, that of the Arbudāchala, etc.. Even the conventional descriptions of seasons, bathing, flower-gathering, etc. in the S. D. K. are more objective and realistic than those found in the recognized Mahākāvyas.

The descriptions of battles,–and there are many–

as I have remarked before, are always full of vigour and realistic without ever approaching the grotesque.

The story of Mayaṇallā is told with a fine touch of emotion; one almost wished, that at least for this portion, Hemachandra might have forgotten his grammar.

The episodes are arranged in such a way as always to maintain interest. The S. D. K. possesses many of the characteristics of a good and vigorous epic but they are all hidden under its uncouth and forbidding exterior. The simile of cocoanut given to Bhāravi's + Kirāta applies more appropriately to the S. D. K. as far as its exterior is concerned, and if not equally, almost equally to its inner substance.

The exterior of the P. D. K. is less uncouth. Its descriptions are good specimens of Prākṛta poetry. Of the poetic worth of the Prākṛta verses put in as illustrations in the Rayaṇāvalī the following remarks of Prof. Banerjee give a correct idea.

"A careful reading of the gāthās ... would lead one to discover sense and highly poetical sense in these gāthās.... In fact these gāthās...form a valuable contribution to Prākṛta lyric poetry at the same time comparable to the Sattasai of Hāla" (p. XLI). "They will be appreciated, it is hoped, by every lover of poetry as a remarkable feat of ingenuity worthy of Hemachandra" (p. LI Introduction.).

A careful and systematic study of the T. S. P. C. will reveal genuine poetic qualities of description, emotion, and story-telling and prove Hemachandra to be a Mahā Kavi.

+ नारिकेलफलसंमितं वचो भारवेः etc. मल्लिनाथ.

The verses placed at the end of every pāda of the S. H. show his vigorous style and mastery in the poetry of the court.

Many of the illustrative verses in the Chhandonuṣāsana in the Saṃskṛta, the Prākṛta and the Apabhramṣa are genuine pieces of lyric poetry. If, as is the opinion of some scholars, most of them are Hemachandra's own compositions, they would show Hemachandra to be a writer of fine muktakas.

We have referred to Hemachandra's devotional hymns and Principal's Dhruva's remarks on one of them.

Thus it would appear that Hemachandra was not only a great writer of Ṣāstras but a writer of good poetry also. He was really a master of Lakshaṇa, Sāhitya and Tarka,-Grammar, Literature and Philosophy.

Let us consider Hemachandra's personality. He had - if the traditional explanation of his name is not, merely, a literary flourish - a bright complexion of golden hue; probably he had an imposing exterior. His works reveal him to be a great savant, an able writer of Ṣāstric works, a good poet. He was a great reformer of public morals - for that was what he achieved through his influence on Siddharāja Jayasimha and Kumārapāla His prayers show him to be a genuine and thoughtful saint; and an autobiographic reference shows him to be a Yogin. Hemachandra was a genuine devotee of the Omniscient. No doubt, Hemachandra was a great man not only of his age, but of all ages. It may not be altogether irrelevant to say, here, that the Moḍha community of Kathiawar which gave one great man in Hemachandra, has given another great man to the world in Mohandas Karamachand Gandhi.

THE KAVYANUṢĀSANA

Hemachandra's aim in composing his various treatises, always, was to achieve completeness of information on their respective subjects. In doing this, he, however, appears to have been influenced by the needs of primary and advanced students. This double purpose was fulfilled by adopting the method of first writing a text-book consisting of sūtras with a commentary on them giving in a systematic and lucid form as much information of the subject as was of primary importance and necessary to give practical proficiency in it. To achieve completeness, he wrote additional commentaries incorporating all the available discussions of the previous writers on the subject treated. These additional commentaries were, of course, intended for advanced students who wanted to be masters of the subject.

The third point that may be noted in this connection is Hemachandra's aim to achieve authenticity in his works. This has made him give the previous discussions on the subject almost in the words of the authors themselves. In order to make his works current and authentic on the subjects which were generally discussed by Brāhmanical writers, it was, probably, thought necessary by this Jaina Āchārya to adopt this method. This procedure, however, has laid him open to the charge of plagiarism and given his works an appearance of compilations. But a careful and a minute study of his works reveals that Hemachandra has always treated his subjects with great

discrimination and definiteness and mentioned the names of authors where he thought that particular contributions were theirs.

A careful study of the S.H. and all the commentaries on it written by the author himself will bear out these remarks ×. A similar study of the Kāvyānuṣāsana confirms them.

The Kāvyānuṣāsana consists of 208 sūtras divided into eight Adhyāyas. The first adhyāya contains 25, the second 59, the third 10, the fourth 9, the fifth 9, the sixth 31, the seventh 52 and the eighth 13 sūtras respectively. In these 208 sūtras, so to say, is concentrated the whole subject of Samskṛta Poetics in all its aspects. This Kāvyānuṣāsana of 208 sūtras is, as the author himself says, 'extended (pratanyate)' in the commentary which is known by the name Alamkārachūdāmaṇi. The name of the Alamkārachūdamaṇi is mentioned in the colophons at the end of all the adhyāyas, but nowhere in the body of the text. This indicates that naming the commentary might have been a later idea.

There is, as we have seen, another commentary which the author, in its first introductory verse calls the "Viveka of the Kāvyānuṣāsana". This, again, indicates that the author looks upon not only the sūtras but the vṛtti (commentary) also as Kāvyānuṣāsana. In the vṛtti, the Kāvyānuṣāsana is said to be 'extended (pratanyate)' while here, the Viveka is said to be 'extended in detail (pra–vi–tanyte).' This is also clear from the first line of the introductory verse where the purpose of writing the Viveka is

× Pandit Bechardas's article on the S. H. previously referred to will be found very useful in such a study.

expressed as 'to explain at certain places what is written and to add something new at certain places.' A study of the Viveka shows that this purpose is carried out properly in it.

The number of quotations given in the Al. C. as illustrations are about 740, as authorities about 67, in all about 807; those in the Viveka, as illustrations about 624; as authorities about 201, in all about 825. Thus the total number of quotations in the Kāvyānuṣāsana is about 1632.

In the Al.C. and the Viveka Hemachandra mentions by name about fifty authors, and about eightyone works. Many of the works named belong to the authors mentioned. In addition to these, I have traced the names of some works from which quotations are taken but whose names are not mentioned by Hemachandra. All these references will be found in indexes of authors and works (pp. 521–526).

This will give an idea of the usefulness of the Kāvyānuṣāsana for the history of Samskṛta Poetics and Literature.

Now, let us see what problems of the Samskṛta Poetics are discussed in the Kāvyānuṣāsana. The first sūtra is devoted as usual to mangala-namaskāra; while the second sūtra, after informing us that the correctness of speech has been discussed by the author in his Ṣabdānuṣāsana, lays down the Ṣāstra-prayojana (the purpose of the treatise) viz:—the poetic aspect of the language. In other words—the author tells us that he is discussing Poetics in the treatise (pp. 1–3).

The third sūtra deals with the abhidheya prayojana that is the purpose of the subject of poetics that is the purpose of poetry. This purpose is laid down by Hemachandra as threefold, viz:—aesthetic pleasure (ānanda), fame (yaṣas), and to be sweetly didactic (Kāntātulyatayā Upadeṣāya). Here it may be noted that Hemachandra has omitted the three additional purposes given by Mammaṭa, viz:—earning of money, knowledge of worldly behaviour (courtly behaviour etc) and the removal of evil (through the mysterious influence of the poetic hymns etc.). The reasons for not accepting these three purposes are succintly given in the Al. C. and more clearly with illustrations in the Viveka (pp. 3–4). This illustrates the method of Hemachandra.

The fourth sūtra gives the 'cause of poetry' (Kāvyasya Kāraṇam) viz:–pratibhā – genius – which is explained in the Al. C. as 'intelligence occupied in imagining new things (nava–navollekha – ṣālinī prajṇā)'. Here also Hemachandra differs from Mammaṭa in laying emphasis on the main cause, which according to him is 'pratibhā' or genius while the other causes mentioned by Mammaṭa are regarded as mere accessories by him. This discrimination of what is of primary importance and what is secondary is really an important thing in such a subject as poetics.

In the two sūtras, five and six–this pratibhā (genius) is described in Jaina terminology. The seventh sūtra tells us that this genius is to be trained (lit. polished) by means of the study and the practice of the art. The eighth sūtra mentions the subjects of study which are briefly described in the Al. C. while expounded with illustrations in the Viveka. The ninth and the tenth

sūtras describe the poetic practice which is briefly explained in the Al. C., but in detail with a great number of illustrations in the Viveka (pp. 13–23).

The eleventh sūtra defines the nature of poetry; this definition differs a little from that of Mammaṭa in the place it assigns to alaṃkāra (figurative speech) in the definition; while rare instances of poetic speech without alaṃkāra are included by putting the conjunctive particle 'cha' in the sūtra. In the succeeding sūtras all the terms of the definition are defined and discussed. These terms are – Ṣabda (Word), Artha (Meaning), Dosha (Defect), Guṇa (Merit), and Alaṃkāra (Figurative Speech). The twelfth sūtra gives the general definition of guṇa and dosha with reference to their functions. The thirteenth defines the general nature of Alaṃkāra while the fourteenth describes their utility to Rasa. The sūtras 15–25 define and discuss the nature and relation of Ṣabda and Artha; the last sūtra–the 26th adds Rasa as one of the Vyangya arthas (suggested meanings), the Abhidhā, the Lakshaṇā and the Vyanjanā and the Vyanjanā arthas having been discussed in the previous sūtras. This finishes the first Adhyāya.

The second Adhyāya of the Kāvyānuṣāsana is devoted to Rasa, Bhāva, Rasābhāsa and Bhāvābhāsa and the classification of poetry as first rate, second rate and third rate on the principle of poetic excellence. The first 55 sūtras are devoted to the former subject while the last three are devoted to classification. This subject of classification has been discussed by Mammaṭa in the first Adhyāya which becomes a stumbling block to a student who has not yet understood what poetic excellence is. The discussion of it after Rasa, as in the Kāvyānuṣāsana, is a distinct advantage to the student.

As this sort of classification, in the opinion of Hemachandra, originated with Mammaṭa, his name is mentioned with the quotation of the Kārikās in the Viveka.

The Viveka on this adhyāya extensively quotes from the Bharata Nāṭyaṣāstra as also from the commentary of Abhinavagupta on it. The whole portion discussing Rasa is quoted almost verbatim from Abhinavagupta's commentary.

The third adhyāya, in its ten sūtras, deals with the Doshas. The Al. C. and the Viveka fully discuss the subject. The Viveka, as usual, gives a great number of illustrations and quotes passages from the Kāvya-mīmāmsā of Rājaṣekhara on the subject of Deṣa and Kāla that is Geography and seasons of India. The reason of not mentioning the name of Rājaṣekhara here might be that, in the view of Hemachandra, Rājaṣekhara also might have taken this matter from some other author.

The fourth adhyāya deals with guṇas. In the first sūtra the three guṇas - Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda are mentioned. In the Al. C., Hemachandra following Mammaṭa, says that the guṇas are only three and not five or ten. The Viveka on the Sūtra is very important as it discusses in detail the views of Bharata, Mangala, Vāmana, Dandin etc. mentioning their names (pp. 274–287). The discussion in the Viveka on the relation of metres and guṇas is interesting (pp. 287–288). The remaining eight sūtras define the three guṇas and discuss how they are related to the quality of the syllables used (pp. 289 - 294).

The fifth adhyāya treats of the six Ṣabdālaṃkāras

which the Viveka enumerates as Anuprāsa, Yamaka, Chitra, Ṣlesha, Vakrokti, and Punaruktābhāsa. Their varieties are also discussed.

The first sūtra defines Anuprāsa while the second distinguishes Lāṭānuprāsa. The third sūtra defines the Yamaka while the fourth says where it is possible. The Al. C. on the fourth sūtra describes and illustrates the varieties of Yamaka. The fifth sūtra defines the Chitra, while the sixth defines Ṣlesha. The seventh sūtra mentions the varieties of Ṣlesha. The eighth sūtra defines Vakrokti while the ninth defines Punaruktābhāsa. Many of the illustrations for the Ṣabdālamkāras are taken from the Devīṣataka of Ānandavardhana, who is mentioned in the Viveka on the fifth sūtra as Noṇasuta Ṣrīmān Ānandavardhana, that is, Anandavardhana – the son of Noṇa (p. 321). Rudraṭa's Kāvyālaṃkāra has also been largely drawn upon in this Adhyāya.

The Viveka on the seventh sūtra, while explaining Pāṭhadharmatva (pp.333–336) quotes at length from the Bharata Nātya Ṣāstra–probably from Abhinavagupta's commentary. This passage is interesting from many points of view.

The sixth adhyāya treats of twentynine artha – alamkāras including Samkara. It will be seen that Hemachandra has greatly reduced the number of principal Arthālamkāras, which according to Mammaṭa, are sixtyone in number *. This Hemachandra has

---

* For the history of the development of Alamkāras see Prof. Jacobi's article 'Bhāmaha and Dandin' in Sitzungberichte der Prussian Academie der Wissenschaften or its translation in the Purāttatva Vol. II pp. 81–89.

done by neglecting minor and unimportant distinctions. He 'includes Samsṛshṭi under Samkara, so defines Dīpaka as to include Tulyayogitā in it, defines a figure Parāvṛtti which contains the Paryāya and Parivṛtti of Mammaṭa, omits all those figures that have a touch of Rasa, Bhāva etc. in them (viz:—Rasavat, Preyas, Ūrjasvi Samāhita), and passes over Ananvaya, Upameyopamā as varieties of Upamā, includes under Nidarshanā the figures Prativastūpamā, Drashṭānta, and Nidarshanā of others. He uses the names Jāti and Anyokti for Svabhāvokti and Aprastutapraṣamsā '. +

The twenty-nine arthālamkāras that Hemachandra discusses in 31 sūtras are enumerated by the Viveka as follows:—

(1) Upamā	(2) Utprekshā	(3) Rūpaka
(4) Nidarṣanā	(5) Dīpaka	(6) Anyokti
(7) Paryāyokti	(8) Atiṣayokti	(9) Ākshepa
(10) Virodha	(11) Sahokti	(12) Samāsokti
(13) Jāti	(14) Vyājastuti	(15) Slesha
(16) Vyatireka	(17) Arthāntaranyāsa	
(18) Sasamdeha	(19) Apahnuti	(20) Parivṛtti
(21) Anumāna	(22) Smṛti	(23) Bhrānti
(24) Vishama	(25) Sama	(26) Samuchhaya
(27) Parisamkhyā	(28) Kāraṇamāla	(29) Saṃkara

The definition of Upamā हृद्यं साधर्म्यमुपमा - that Hemachandra has adopted is different from that of Mammaṭa. He has laid emphasis on the aesthetic element in the definition.

The Viveka, however, mentions and discusses all the alamkāras given by previous writers including Bhoja

+Kane's Introduction to the Sāhitya Darpaṇa pp. CXIV etc.